FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-219
Tuesday
13 November 1990

9

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-219 CONTENTS *13 November 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

NATO Generals Begin Official Visit *[TASS]* 1
  Meet With Yazov *[TASS]* 1
  Meet With Shevardnadze *[TASS]* 1
Soviet Support in Gulf Hostilities Questioned *[Moscow International]* 2
KGB Reports French, Chilean Nationals Expelled *[TASS]* 2

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Articles Assess Baker's Visit With Leaders 3
  Shevardnadze Talks Highlighted *[IZVESTIYA 10 Nov]* 3
  KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA Views Talks *[10 Nov]* 4
  'Goodwill' Seen *[TASS]* 4
Bush, Cheney Cited on Increase in Gulf Forces *[IZVESTIYA 10 Nov]* 5
Articles Assess U.S. Gulf Buildup 6
  Peaceful Solution Not Ruled Out *[PRAVDA 10 Nov]* 6
  Buildup Seen as 'Ultimatum' *[IZVESTIYA 11 Nov]* 7

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Congratulates Emperor Akihito *[TASS]* 7
Lukyanov Heads Delegation to Japan *[Moscow International]* 7
'Good Prospects' Seen for Northeast Asian Ties *[Moscow International]* 8

Near East & South Asia

IZVESTIYA Examines Latest Gulf Developments *[13 Nov]* 9
PRAVDA Interviews Saudi Prince on Gulf Crisis *[11 Nov]* 10
Belyayev Urges Soviet Role as Gulf Mediator *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 44]* 11
Status of Soviet Citizens in Iraq Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 13
Soviet Muslims Said Volunteering To Fight for Iraq *[Moscow TV]* 13

West Europe

Gorbachev, FRG's Kohl Meet, Exchange Greetings *[TASS]* 13
Leaders Sign Friendship Treaty, Give Speeches 14
  PRAVDA Notes Gorbachev Speech *[10 Nov]* 14
  Kohl Speech *[Moscow Radio]* 15
  Leaders Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 16
Gorbachev, Kohl Hold News Conference 10 Nov *[TASS]* 16
Soviet, FRG Leaders Visit German Cities 10 Nov 20
  Arrive in Rheinland-Pfalz *[TASS]* 20
  Address Deidesheim Residents *[TASS]* 21
Gorbachev Meets With Genscher, FRG Politicians *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 21
PRAVDA Carries Leaders' Dinner Speeches 23
  Gorbachev's Remarks *[11 Nov]* 23
  Kohl's Dinner Speech *[11 Nov]* 25
Leaders Give Speeches Upon Gorbachev's Departure 27

- Gorbachev Praises Visit *[Moscow TV]* 27
- Kohl Promises To Push Reforms *[Moscow TV]* 28

General Moiseyev Hails FRG Visit Results *[TASS]* 29
Commentary Notes Gorbachev-Kohl 'Solidarity' *[TASS]* 29
Commentaries View, Assess Bilateral Treaty 30

- Called CSCE Process Outgrowth *[TASS]* 30
- Treaty Opens 'New Chapter' *[PRAVDA 11 Nov]* 31

German Coverage of Gorbachev's FRG Visit *[cross-reference]* 32
Commentaries Preview Gorbachev FRG Visit 32

- Germans Welcome Visit *[TASS]* 32
- 'Close Link' Guaranteed *[TASS]* 33
- Joint Treaty Previewed *[PRAVDA 9 Nov]* 33
- Treaty's Importance Highlighted *[Moscow Radio]* 35

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev, Yeltsin May Lead New 'Coalition' *[Moscow Radio]* 36

- 'Doomed' To Cooperate *[TASS]* 37
- Hopes for Solidarity Expressed *[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]* 37

Red Square Gunman Arrest Details Reported *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 37

- Staging of Shooting Denied *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 13 Nov]* 38
- Newspaper Profiles Gunman *[TASS]* 38
- KGB Denies Allegations of Other Attacks *[Moscow Radio]* 39

Bakatin Reports on 7 Nov GOSR Demonstrations *[Moscow International]* 39
CPSU Secretariat Debates Union Integrity *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 39
Tarazevich Views Union Treaty Issues *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 23 Oct]* 41
Economic Expert Views Escalating 'Crisis' *[Hamburg DIE WELT 9 Nov]* 43
Emerging Soviet Securities Market Described *[TASS]* 45
Intermovement Accuses TV of Slander *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Kryuchkov Answers Journalists Questions *[Moscow TV]* 45
Kalugin Complaint Hearing Postponed *[TASS]* 46
Soviet Citizens See 'Bleak' Future *[TASS]* 46
Soviet Employees Working Abroad To Retain Salary *[Moscow Radio]* 46
Gorbachev Orders Transfer of Chernenko Bust *[TASS]* 46
GLASNOST Chief Editor Outlines Paper's Plans *[Moscow TV]* 47
Chief Editor of Teacher's Newspaper Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 47
Journal Editor on Publishing Plans *[Moscow TV]* 48
New International Police Magazine Published *[Moscow TV]* 48
Filaret Named Peace Movement Candidate Deputy *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* 48
Knowledge Society Chairman Released *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Roy Medvedev on Reappraisal of Revolution *[Milan L'UNITA 7 Nov]* 49
State Primary Organizations Deplored *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 3 Nov]* 50

Economic

Ryzhkov Chairs 1st Foreign Currency Meeting *[TASS]* 53
Abalkin Views Paris Economic Meeting Results *[IZVESTIYA 10 Nov]* 53
Moscow Stock Exchange Founded 12 Nov *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Official Examines, Criticizes Bank Reform Law *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* 54
Askenov Comments on Market Reform Efforts *[TASS]* 55
Odessa Unions Oppose Coupon Use in Sales *[TRUD 3 Nov]* 56

Agricultural

Effects of Poor Potato Harvest Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]* 57
Rural Cooperatives' Lack of Rights Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* 58

Western Republics

- Moldova Still in 'Shock' Over Dubossary Deaths *[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]* 79
- Correspondent Describes 2-Week Moldova Stay *[Moscow TV]* 79
- Moldova's Druk Interviewed on 'Vid' Program *[Moscow TV]* 80
- Moldovan Supreme Soviet Discusses Situation *[TASS]* 81
    - Premier Briefs Legislature *[TASS]* 81
- Session Shows 'Irreconcilability' *[TASS]* 81
- Session Continues 13 Nov *[TASS]* 82
- Moldovan Communists Hold Plenum, Discuss Crisis 82
    - Call Situation 'Complex' *[TASS]* 82
    - Want Peaceful Solution *[TASS]* 82
    - Adopt Declaration *[TASS]* 83
    - PRAVDA Reports Plenum *[11 Nov]* 83
    - Participants View Plenum *[TASS]* 84
- TASS Cites Dnestr Calls For Interior Troops 84
- Moldovan Minister Views Foreign Policy Positions *[TASS]* 85
- Moldovan MVD Minister Urges Political Resolution *[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]* 85
- RSFSR Deputies Visit, Meet Moldova Leader *[TASS]* 86
- 'Thousands' Picket Ukraine Supreme Soviet *[Moscow Radio]* 86
    - Supreme Soviet Considers Demands *[TASS]* 86
- 'Thousands' Attend Rally Over Teacher's Arrest *[Kiev International]* 87
- Regional Council Discusses Crimean Issues *[TASS]* 87
- Ukrainian Oblast Introduces Coupon System *[Moscow Radio]* 87
- Kiev Taxi Drivers Protest Gasoline Payment System *[Moscow Radio]* 87
- Ukrainian Foreign Ministry Establishes Institute *[Moscow Radio]* 87
- Belorussian Communist Party Officials Meet *[Minsk Radio]* 88
- Further on Belorussian 7 Nov Statement *[Moscow Radio]* 88

Caucasus

- Georgia Forbids Food Sales Outside Republic *[TASS]* 88
- Georgians Vote in Runoff Elections 11 Nov *[TASS]* 88
    - 'Round Table' Scores 'Convincing' Win *[TASS]* 89
- Georgia Forms Foreign Trade Departments *[TASS]* 89
- Armenian Commission To Prepare New Constitution *[ARMENPRES]* 90
- Azerbaijan Government Meeting Reported *[Baku Radio]* 90

Central Asia

- Kirghizia Appoints New Deputy Premier *[SOVETSKAYA KIRGHIZIYA 1 Nov]* 90
- Weapons Seized at Karaganda Airport *[Moscow Radio]* 90
- Ust-Kamenogorsk Ecological Situation Reviewed *[Moscow TV]* 90

NATO Generals Begin Official Visit

LD1111143690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1315 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 11 November (TASS)—General Vigleik Eide, chairman of the NATO military committee, and General John Galvin, supreme allied commander of NATO Forces in Europe, arrived here today on an official visit at the invitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Yazov, USSR defense minister. Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, met them at the airport.

Interviewed at the airport by a TASS correspondent, General Eide noted that he is satisfied not only because the appearance of the two blocs in Europe is changing before one's very eyes, but also because, thanks to contacts, there has been a marked improvement in relations between the military leaders of the countries belonging to NATO and the Warsaw Pact. "The main thing for which the relations between the military leaders of these blocs is notable is frankness, the sincere desire to find compromises on all questions." General Galvin subscribed to the opinion of his colleague, adding that he expects positive results from the visit.

A packed program awaits the high-ranking NATO generals. On Monday they are to have talks with the military leadership of the Soviet Union. Meetings with President Mikhail Gorbachev and Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze are not excluded.

It is intended that the guests will visit military installations—the Taman Guards' motorized rifle division and the Military Academy of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, the main forge for training higher command cadres.

From Wednesday, the programs for the visit of the NATO generals will branch off to different regions. General Eide will visit Leningrad, where he will be acquainted with the cultural and historical sights of the city on the Neva.

General Galvin will visit the southern cities of the country, Kiev, Yalta, and also Sevastopol, a naval base on the Black Sea.

Meet With Yazov

LD1211134590 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov met General Vigleik Eide, chairman of NATO Military Committee, and General John Galvin, NATO's supreme allied commander Europe, in Moscow today. The two generals are currently in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

"The time has come when meetings between high-ranking representatives of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO) and NATO are held practically every month," Yazov told TASS.

This, in his view, is not only a manifestation of mutual respect but also an illustration of the policy being pursued by the Soviet Union, the United States and many other countries to establish relations of peace and cooperation.

"The word peace has now become not simply a symbol but a necessity for which one must work," Yazov emphasised. He voiced satisfaction that the military are also involved in this work for peace.

The WTO and NATO begin to build relations "on new principles, including solutions to complex issues connected with the settlement of conflict situations," Yazov said.

"The growing military contacts between East and West are opening the way for the signing of a European conventional force reduction treaty," Yazov said.

He believes that changes taking place in Europe have augmented opportunities to ensure security by political means. The elimination of the unnatural division of the continent is an important direction of these changes," Yazov said.

Chief of the Soviet General Staff Mikhail Moiseyev also met Generals Eide and Galvin today.

The NATO military leaders visited the Taman Motorised Rifle Division in the Moscow region. They familiarised themselves with the life and combat training of the servicemen.

Meet With Shevardnadze

LD1211200690 Moscow TASS in English 1952 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 12 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met NATO Supreme Allied Commander John Galvin and NATO's Military Committee chairman Vigleik Eide here today to disucss the establishment of a new peaceful order in Europe and the overcoming of confrontation and cold war legacy.

During the meeting, both sides pointed to the need to make the current positive changes in the world irreversible.

They expressed conviction that efforts by all states to strengthen security and stability on the continent were needed to consolidate the transition to post-confrontation politics and a civilised partnership.

The fundamental importance of the forthcoming Paris summit of countries participating in the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe and a treaty on conventional armaments in Europe, to be signed at the summit, was emphasized.

The sides discussed prospects for the European disarmament dialogue. They pointed to the importance of the continuation of the Vienna talks, at which further steps to reduce armed forces and armaments would be negotiated, and the importance of the discussion of military doctrines.

It was pointed out that the range of negotiated subjects should be extended. Above all, they should include the problem of tactical nuclear armaments, about which the negotiating sides had already reached an understanding in principle.

Shevardnadze presented arguments in favour of the inclusion of naval forces in the negotiating process.

Soviet Support in Gulf Hostilities Questioned

LD1111153190 Moscow World Service in English
1210 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Mikhail Mayorov commentary]

[Text] Over the past week no gunshots have been fired in the Persian Gulf area, though the British newspaper DAILY STAR [as heard] predicted that the war there would start in the first week of November. In his comment on the decision to dispatch an additional task force to southwest Asia, Richard Cheney, the U.S. secretary of defense, noted that no deadline was set for that. According to him, the positioning of a new force will not be completed until 1 January 1991. Now, does this mean that hostilities will not start before the new year? Mikhail Mayorov of our staff elaborates.

It is not ruled out that one-third of the entire U.S. Army, about half of the Marine Corps and six out of the 14 aircraft carrier-borne groups will be stationed in the Persian Gulf area by the beginning of next year. Where and when did Washington have such a mailed fist overseas? President Bush calls this amassing of force the insurance of an adequate offense potential. Though the U.S. Administration still talks about its adherence to a settlement by peaceful means, it is evident that the sights are set on the need to drive Iraq out of Kuwait, occupied by its forces. What will serve as a signal for the attack, the United Nations sanction to use military force, or the decision that Washington is going to take without any consultation with the international community? The British prime minister, Margaret Thatcher, believes that her country and the United States have the juridical right to open hostilities in the Persian Gulf without waiting for the United Nations' approval. George Bush also speaks about freedom of action, though the administration, as the President claims, will be seeking to get the sanction from the community of nations.

Will military operations be launched with or without the United Nations sanction is something the Soviet Union cannot be indifferent to. As it follows from the talks between President Gorbachev and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in Moscow, as well as from the talks with the German Chancellor Helmut Kohl in Bonn, Moscow continues siding with those who insist on the withdrawal of the Iraqi troops from Kuwait. The Soviet leadership stands firmly against any split in what is termed as the anti-Iraqi front, but is it possible to count on the support of the Soviet Union in case hostilities break out in the Persian Gulf area? Though following Baker's visit to Moscow some U.S. observers give a positive answer to the question, we still think it would be premature to arrive at any final conclusions on the score. At the news conference in Bonn the Soviet president gave to understand that that could happen only with the approval of the United Nations Security Council. The best thing, however, would not be to engage in any guesswork. They don't rule out here in Moscow that the Soviet leadership wil try to go ahead with its peacemaking mission which Yevgeniy Primakov would carry out during his latest tours of the Middle East, Southwest Asia and also of some European capitals. Certain new steps in that direction will probably be taken this week, Mikhail Mayorov writes in conclusion.

KGB Reports French, Chilean Nationals Expelled

LD0911134390 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1315 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 9 Nov (TASS)—The USSR KGB Public Relations Center announced today that, following repeated warnings by the authorities, B.G. Miller, a citizen of Chile, and N.A. Makova, a citizen of France, who were in Leningrad by private invitation, have been expelled from the USSR for infringing the regulations for the stay of foreigners in the USSR.

United States & Canada

Articles Assess Baker's Visit With Leaders

Shevardnadze Talks Highlighted

PM0911193190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Nov 90 Union Edition p 4

[Article by diplomatic correspondent M. Yusin: "James Baker's 'Moscow Marathon.' Results of U.S. Secretary of State's Visit to Our Country"]

[Text] On 9 November, having completed his brief working visit, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker flew from Moscow to London—the penultimate stage of his foreign tour. The "diplomatic marathon" that began Thursday morning in the Foreign Ministry House of Receptions on Aleksey Tolstoy Street ended only late in the evening. The secretary of state and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze spent 10 hours at the negotiating table. The consultations, which were either one-on-one or involved a very narrow circle of people, were interrupted just once—after midday, when Baker had two hours of conversations with President Gorbachev.

Replying to journalists' questions right after the end of the talks, Shevardnadze said that the meeting was very constructive. The central topic, as was to be expected, was the situation in the Persian Gulf. The ministers devoted the whole of the morning (until the talks with Gorbachev) to analyzing the situation in the crisis zone.

According to Shevardnadze, "a very important new aspect" has emerged in the U.S. position. "Precisely what, I would not like to specify at present," he said. Speaking of the results of the talks, Soviet diplomats also mentioned the Americans' "interesting ideas which merit serious study." It was a question, as was understandable, of new ways to put pressure on Saddam Husayn. But neither our diplomats nor U.S. ones told the press precisely what they had in mind. Probably the time has not yet come to reveal their cards to Baghdad.

In their reports of the Moscow talks, foreign reports single out as the number one news item Shevardnadze's statement that the use of force against Iraq cannot be ruled out. The minister emphasized that such a decision can be adopted only with the sanction of the UN Security Council. At the same time Shevardnadze pointed out that, while not ruling out the use of force, Moscow still considers this an undesirable path and seeks to use all possible means to exert a peaceful influence on Baghdad.

As for Baker, in a statement at a brief news conference before the final round of talks, he confirmed that the United States also prefers a peaceful solution. It will conduct the search for this solution in close cooperation with the Soviet Union. At the same time, the secretary of state declared that any "intermediate option" enabling Iraq to keep part of Kuwaiti territory is unacceptable to Washington. This coincides with Moscow's viewpoint. Both Gorbachev and Shevardnadze have declared the inadmissibility of concessions to the aggressor.

The Soviet diplomats who talked with members of the "Baker team" got the feeling that, after visiting Saudi Arabia, the Americans are "not as bellicose as before." However, this change (if it has really happened) has not yet been reflected in official statements. There is still a great danger that combat operations will commence.

On the eve of Baker's visit assumptions were being made that the Americans would sound out the Soviet reaction to the adoption of a Security Council resolution permitting the use of force against an aggressor. (Such a measure is provided for in Article 42 of the UN Charter.) Journalists tried to ascertain from Shevardnadze whether this question was discussed, but they were unsuccessful. However, certain indirect facts make it possible to assume that this topic was raised at the Moscow talks and, in all probability, the secretary of state received guarantees that, given a vote at the United Nations, the Americans need not fear the Soviet veto. Foreign Ministry spokesmen made it clear in private conversations that, in the event of the Security Council's adopting a corresponding resolution, the use of force against Saddam Husayn by the Americans will not meet with serious objections from Moscow. For its part the United States promised, to all appearances, not to take any serious steps without consulting the Soviet Union. Shevardnadze shared with journalists his confidence that Washington will not launch a military action against Iraq without first notifying Moscow of it.

Asked whether he was planning to follow Baker's example and tour the Near East, Shevardnadze replied that there is no such need at present. However, he did not rule out the possibility that it could arise in the future. Shevardnadze reported that other Soviet representatives are preparing a tour of countries in the region. The minister did not specify precisely whom he meant—whether it would be a Foreign Ministry delegation or whether another tour by Yevgeniy Primakov is on the agenda.

The chief topic in the evening talks, which began after Baker's meeting with Gorbachev, was the reduction of conventional arms in Europe. Groups of experts who had been in session until late the previous night had brought to light 46 disputed points which have to be settled before the Vienna accords can be signed. During the talks the ministers were able to resolve the majority of them (approximately 80 percent, as specialists later confirmed). According to Shevardnadze, all the fundamental disagreements were eliminated. There remain a few technical questions which can perfectly well be resolved at the level of working groups within a week.

Issues on which it has not yet been possible to reach agreement mainly concern the upcoming inspections to verify the destruction of arms. In particular, a question arises about who will meet the cost of the inspectors' stay. As is known, the Soviet Union is faced with destroying a greater quantity of arms than the United States. Consequently, there will also be more inspections on our territory. There is a rule in world practice: The host side meets the cost. However, regarding the fact that one day's stay by a group of inspectors costs $2,500 and 60,000 rubles, such a decision creates serious financial difficulties for Moscow. The Americans will evidently agree to share the cost burden with us. Working groups have to determine the exact proportion.

Questions of the reduction of strategic offensive arms were touched on (although not in such detail). Shevardnadze is optimistic: In his opinion, the Soviet-U.S. treaty will be signed at the end of this year or the beginning of next.

Regional conflicts were not ignored in the talks either. In the assessment of both sides, the dialogue on the situation in Cambodia, Angola, and Afghanistan proved fruitful. This applies to Afghanistan in particular. A Soviet diplomat who participated in the discussion said that Moscow's and Washington's views on the means of achieving a settlement in that country have come so close together that the adoption of a joint statement on Afghanistan can be expected before the end of the year.

Shevardnadze's next meeting with Baker will take place in Paris, where both will go to participate in the CSCE conference that begins 19 November. The precise timing of Shevardnadze's visit to Washington was not defined. The probable date remains as before—the beginning of December.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA Views Talks

PM1011192990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Nov 90 p 3

[Report by A. Vasilyev: "'The Americans Have Promised To Consult Us,' USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze Told Our Correspondent After His Meeting with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker"]

[Excerpts] The talks between USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker began at 0900 on 8 November and lasted until 1530, including lunch. [passage omitted]

During the discussion of regional problems—southern Africa, the Horn of Africa, and others, attention focused on Afghanistan. Of late all such meetings have produced progress in this question, with both the U.S. and the Soviet side prepared to make concessions. It has emerged from conversations with informed sources that on this occasion the USSR and the United States concurred in the opinion that it is necessary to form a transitional government of representatives of the warring sides in Afghanistan with the participation of the present leader Najibullah, and subsequently to hold free elections. It remains to persuade the mujahidin and Najibullah, which may be problematic. Be that as it may, progress in this area has been achieved, and a joint Soviet-American statement on Afghanistan can be expected in the near future. [passage omitted]

I was able to talk to E.A. Shevardnadze only after the talks had ended.

[Vasilyev] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, can you state with confidence that the United States will take military action against Iraq only within the UN framework and after consulting the Soviet Union?

[Shevardnadze] As yet I cannot be absolutely sure that it will act only within the framework of the United Nations. However, I have no doubt that it will consult us.

[Vasilyev] Is the U.S. side still raising the question of dispatching Soviet servicemen to Saudi Arabia?

[Shevardnadze] Yes, it does so constantly. You are familiar with our stance. [Shevardnadze ends]

What else is being discussed in diplomatic circles? In Moscow the "men in silk vests" are discussing with keen interest the "Primakov mission" and even concluding that Eduard Amvrosiyevich's days are numbered and the appointment of Yevgeniy Maksimovich to the post of USSR foreign minister is in the offing. I beg to differ. After all, when we say that the West is giving the Soviet Union credits on the basis of the Soviet president's "good name," we forget that M.S. Gorbachev's image abroad has largely been created and is maintained by the head of our foreign policy department.

As for the "confrontation" between Shevardnadze and Primakov, I believe that it is fictitious. They are both skillfully playing the same game, and that can only be the case if the left hand knows perfectly well what the right hand is doing. Making strongly worded speeches from the UN rostrum, E.A. Shevardnadze is looking after the "western front" of our foreign policy while Ye.M. Primakov, whom television viewers throughout the world have seen being slapped on the back by Saddam Husayn, is upholding the "eastern front." I am convinced that the present actions of the Soviet Foreign Ministry will be included in future textbooks as an example in the chapter on "How to avoid being drawn into a hopeless adventure." Provided, of course, that we manage to maintain the balance....

'Goodwill' Seen

LD1111162790 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By TASS commentator Pavel Vasilyev]

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS—The fact that U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in Moscow on Thursday were held as consultations between countries no longer regarding each other as potential enemies was a radical departure, it is believed in Soviet diplomatic circles.

Hence the good will and constructive results during the examination of arms limitation and reduction, including unexpected problems that have arisen at a time when all aspects of a treaty on conventional Armed Forces in Europe seemed to have been hammered out.

While previously, problems cropping up so unexpectedly would have proven serious irritants, this time the military and diplomats were able to resolve the issue of regional distribution of armaments remaining in Europe fairly quickly and constructively.

Further progress was made towards a treaty reducing strategic offensive arms and its signing this year seems likely.

The discussions of regional problems were also intensive and fruitful, departing ever further from the old "zero-result game" when an advantage of one side inevitably spelled a disadvantage for the other.

The new attitude could help bring about a breakthrough in Afghanistan, Angola and some other problems before the year is out.

The same attitude marked the discussion of the Gulf crisis, the most burning issue. Meeting in Moscow were parties not to potential confrontation but to constructive cooperation. This interaction is taking place against a background of tension provoked by aggression and the increasing need to undo its consequences.

The basic guidelines remain intact: the categorical rejection of aggression and the need for international unity. Everything should be in line with the premise that, as President Gorbachev stressed during a meeting with Baker, no cracks should appear in relations between the two great powers.

That statement is especially important now that a military solution is seeming increasingly likely. But preference—and this was reaffirmed by both sides in Moscow—is being given to a political settlement.

Bush, Cheney Cited on Increase in Gulf Forces

PM0911194590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Nov 90 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent A. Blinov: "Offensive Potential Being Created"]

[Text] Washington—U.S. President G. Bush has ordered large new contingents of ground forces and the Navy to be sent to the Persian Gulf region.

G. Bush himself announced his decision, appearing in the White House press room Thursday accompanied by Defense Secretary Richard Cheney and General Colin Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. According to the President, the stationing of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf region is a response to the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait. It is part of the general diplomatic, economic, and military strategy aimed at prompting Iraq to end its occupation of Kuwait.

Since 6 August, when Operation Desert Shield began, the number of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia has increased from 10,000 to 230,000. This contingent "can successfully counter any new Iraqi aggression."

The President reported that, following consultations with Saudi King Fahd and other allies, the United States has now decided to send new military combined units to the region. It is a question this time of creating "a proper offensive potential in case it is needed to achieve the set goal."

"Does this mean imminent war against Saddam Husayn?" UPI correspondent Helen Thomas asked. "I would like to secure a peaceful solution to the problem," G. Bush declared. "If these troop movements persuade him, so much the better. When he sees what forces are there, he will realize that he cannot oppose such an enemy. I hope that he will see reason."

Neither G. Bush nor R. Cheney and Gen. C. Powell, who spoke after him, gave the precise number of troops being transferred to the Persian Gulf region. However, the list of units and combined units cited by the defense secretary attests that at least 100,000 servicemen are to be moved.

According to R. Cheney, two armored divisions and separate tank units currently stationed in Germany will be sent to Saudi Arabia, as well as the 1st Motorized Infantry Division based at Fort Riley (Kansas) on U.S. territory. In addition, three National Guard brigades will be sent from U.S. territory after additional instruction in the tactics of military operations in desert terrain. It is also proposed to send Air Force reinforcements to Saudi Arabia.

Three more aircraft carriers—the America, the Ranger, and the T. Roosevelt—with accompanying ships will leave for the Near East and Persian Gulf region to supplement the three carrier groups already there, as well as the battleship Missouri and another landing group consisting of 5,000 Marines.

According to unofficial statements by Pentagon staffers, the total personnel of the combined units being transferred will reach 150,000 men. Even if they are sent without auxiliary subunits, these contingents will exceed 100,000 men.

U.S. military experts point out that the new transfers will practically double the U.S. Navy strike forces in the region and will significantly strengthen the offensive potential of the ground forces, particularly thanks to heavy arms. The latter include several hundred tanks, including the most powerful model in the U.S. Army's arsenal—the M1-A1 tank.

When will the transfer of all these forces be completed? Will they be in place, say, by 1 January?

U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney avoided giving an answer to this question. As for the experts who expounded their opinion to press organs, they consider a rapid transfer of such large forces impossible. They suppose that the new contingents will most likely be fully in place only come February.

Are these forces adequate for successful operations against the Iraqi Army? Gen. C. Powell replied that he will not "speculate" in this regard. As for R. Cheney, he replied that he has endeavored so far not to set an "upper limit" on the strength of the contingent of the U.S. Armed Forces in the region.

Commenting on President G. Bush's decision, U.S. mass news organs stress that he put the emphasis on preparations for offensive operations against Iraq. "The general position (of the President) attests to a switch from the defensive to the offensive. This is a new chapter in the development of events in the crisis zone," the press cites the opinion of Ike Skelton, member of the House of Representatives of Congress. "I am concerned that the administration is taking steps to create an offensive potential before the United Nations has adopted a decision permitting offensive actions," Democrat Senator Claiborne Pell, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, declared.

Articles Assess U.S. Gulf Buildup

Peaceful Solution Not Ruled Out

*PM1011191990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Nov 90 Second Edition p 5*

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent V. Gan: "Will There Be War?"]

[Text] Washington, 9 Nov—A radical change in the U.S. approach to the crisis in the Persian Gulf area sparked by Iraq's aggression against Kuwait was announced on the Potomac today. Speaking in the White House, President Bush declared: "I am still full of hope that Husayn will come to understand that he cannot win."

To make the Iraqi president see this for himself as soon as possible, Bush personally announced the decision to send at least 100,000 U.S. servicemen, hundreds of additional tanks and combat aircraft, and three new aircraft carrier groups to the region. For the first time during the confrontation in the sands of the Arabian desert, the White House incumbent noted specifically that this sharp escalation in the military presence is aimed at strengthening the offensive potential of the anti-Iraq coalition and is not merely in the interests of strengthening defense.

In this way Bush has raised the stakes in the confrontation with Iraq, which, as he put it, pursues "our common aims"—of which the main one is Iraq's unconditional withdrawal from Kuwait. Which is precisely what neither the international economic sanctions nor the 300,000 or so servicemen from various countries of the world sent to the region have been able to achieve so far. According to the President's words, Americans must grasp that the action against Iraq does not concern oil alone. "The consequences of our failure to act in this case would be incalculable, since Iraq's aggression represents a challenge not only to the security of Kuwait and other Gulf countries, but also to the better world which we are hoping to build after the 'cold war.'"

It follows from the President's words that he is still hoping that it will be possible to settle the crisis without resorting to "hot" war. Bush also expressed understanding of the arguments of the anti-Iraq coalition allies who are advocating that economic sanctions be given some more time to bite. At the same time, it is obvious that in the President's opinion the sharp buildup in U.S. might "just in case" will by no means come amiss.

Incidentally, Bush only gave the reasons for his decision without going into details about the new scale of the Pentagon deployments in the Persian Gulf area. This was done for him at a joint news conference by Secretary of Defense R. Cheney and C. Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. To reinforce the approximately 230,000 servicemen already in the area, one division is to be transferred from Georgia and two more from Germany, equipped with 600-700 of the latest M-1 tanks. Aircraft carrier groups will be moved to the Gulf from the seas. The marines are summoning their expeditionary corps from North Carolina and another brigade from California. In addition three army brigades of the National Guard are to be called up for active military service in the near future. According to Defense Secretary Cheney the deployment of all these forces will be be completed before 1 January 1991. "We are setting no limits. We are not ruling out any options or the additional dispatch of troops," he said.

In other words, in the opinion of some officials, if there is to be war, it will not be before the beginning of next year. By that time, one-third of the entire U.S. Army, around one-half of the Marine Corps, and six of the 14 U.S. aircraft carrier groups will be concentrated in the Persian Gulf area.

Despite everything, as stated earlier, there is still hope in Washington for a peaceful outcome of what could be described as the most brazen aggression of recent times. U.S. Secretary of State Baker's talks in Moscow, where the Soviet leadership reaffirmed its firm commitment to all the relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions and—most important—expressed possible support for the use of military force against Iraq provided there is a decision to this effect by the world organization, have been rated very positively here. Although, as was noted in the White House, Moscow is clearly not yet ready to say "yes" without reservation to this scenario.

At the same time it seems that it has been decided on the Potomac not to highlight this aspect while expressing "understanding" for the Soviet position with regard to the rightfulness of any unilateral U.S. armed action.

Buildup Seen as 'Ultimatum'

PM1111182190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Union Edition p 5

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Nadein: "Two Months to War? President Bush Sets the U.S. Armed Forces Offensive Aims"]

[Text] Washington—By issuing orders to dispatch 200,000 U.S. servicemen to the Persian Gulf region in addition to the 230,000 who are already there, U.S. President G. Bush has confronted Iraqi leader Saddam Husayn with a powder keg with a smoldering fuse. The length of this fuse is determined by the time it will take to complete the transfer of the additional military formations.

Although the President emphasized several times both in his White House speech and in his replies to journalists' questions that he remains committed to a peaceful solution of the conflict, it is beyond doubt that the actions that are being taken are in the nature of an ultimatum.

Despite the fact that neither the President, nor Defense Secretary R. Cheney and C. Powell, chairman of the Chiefs of Staff, who spoke after him, ruled out the possibility of a further buildup of U.S. military might in the region, observers believe that the middle of January next year, when the announced buildup will be completed, will mark the end of the wait-and-see period.

Incidentally, a number of commentaries clearly seem to suggest that even the current level of might is sufficient to mount an effective campaign against Saddam Husayn. However, the further increase is designed to have the psychological effect of building up tension. From now on President Husayn will have to live under the burden of hourly intelligence reports about the arrival of more and more new enemy combined units at Iraq's borders. The war of nerves will be complemented by the pressure of economic sanctions and constant references to the inevitably brutal nature of the upcoming clash.

"If we have to resort to military solutions, it will cost quite a few U.S. lives," Marine General T. Cook said in an interview with THE WASHINGTON POST. "We must all sit and pray for the sanctions and diplomatic measures to work." The general added that war in the Gulf may be much bloodier that most Americans can imagine.

Judging by appearances, President Bush believes that the next two months will be sufficient for the Iraqi leader to realize that the impending threat is not a bluff, that the great powers are not flying in their half-million-strong armies from the other hemisphere merely to spend billions and then meekly withdraw them again to the sneers of the triumphant aggressor. "I believe that Saddam Husayn must fully and unconditionally submit to the decisions of the United Nations," the U.S. President has said. In reply to a question from a correspondent, President Bush said that he spoke on the telephone with Secretary of State J. Baker in Moscow literally a few minutes before the news conference. "From what the secretary of state told me, I am convinced that we are on the same wavelength (as the Soviet Union) as regards the objectives I have spoken about here," the President noted, emphasizing that "it is very good to have such a firm front between us and the Soviet Union."

The President denied that the involvement of his country in the conflict is due mainly to the threat of an oil crisis. He firmly singled out as the main reason the U.S. desire "to rebut aggression and deprive the aggressor of his reward."

Despite a certain decline in G. Bush's popularity in connection with the budget crisis in Congress and the unfavorable election results, his position as regards the events in the Persian Gulf enjoys the stable support of the U.S. public. However, the first antiwar demonstrations which have already been held in various cities in the country make it possible to conclude that the upcoming two months may also strengthen the pacifist forces in society.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Congratulates Emperor Akihito

LD1211112990 Moscow TASS in English 1117 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 12 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev sent cordial greetings to Emperor Akihito of Japan today, congratulating him on his enthronement.

Gorbachev wished peace, well-being and prosperity to the Japanese people and said he hopes for a gradual expansion of cooperation and good-neighbourly relations between the Soviet Union and Japan.

Lukyanov Heads Delegation to Japan

OW1011072890 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Commentary by Andreyev]

[Text] Listeners, a Soviet delegation headed by USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Lukyanov, will visit Japan on 11 November to attend the Emperor's enthronement ceremony at the invitation of the Japanese Government. In connection with the Soviet delegation's visit to Japan, Radio Moscow commentator Andreyev writes as follows:

This will not be Chairman Lukyanov's first visit to Japan. As deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Council Presidium, Lukyanov visited Tokyo in May, 1989, to attend the Imperial Funeral Service for Emperor Showa. The delegation's upcoming visit to Japan is aimed at attending the Daijosai [the Great Thanksgiving Service to be held after the Enthronement] in order to express the Soviet people's respect for the Japanese people, who sincerely want to have the relations of trust, good-neighborliness, and extensive and fruitful cooperation.

During the next few days, Tokyo will probably be turned into a busy stage for active international political exchanges. Soviet delegation leader Lukyanov will have to deal with a tight schedule of talks with noted politicians from various nations. At these talks, views will be exchanged on the most serious problems in the world situation which have resulted form the deteriorated situation in the Persian Gulf area. Listed as major events in Chairman Lukyanov's schedule are talks with Prime Minister Kaifu, Speaker Sakurauchi of the House of Representatives, Speaker Tsuchiya of the House of Councillors, and influential leaders of various political parties and social organizations. It is expected that at these talks, views will be exchanged on a wide range of issues, including on bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and Japan and on international relations as well.

Of late, the Soviet-Japanese relations are in a good situation, as characterized by an increasingly favorable atmosphere in which the people of both nations desire to have a better understanding of the other nation. If this road should be taken further, the Soviet Union and Japan will be able to enter a new stage in bilateral relations. The Soviet-Japanese summit talks will probably have a great impact on promoting drastic improvement in bilateral relations. In this sense, Mr. Lukyanov's visit to Japan in his capacity as chairman of the Soviet Supreme Council is in itself a very important event, and at the same time, will also contribute greatly to creating an atmosphere of genuinely mutual understanding and good-neighborliness. To drastically change the Soviet-Japanese relations and to overcome various problems pending between the two nations, it will be necessary to create such an environment.

The Soviet Union intends to do its utmost in cooperation with the Japanese side to seek relations that will conform to the positive changes in the world as well as to the objective necessities of our two nations. In making such efforts, it goes without saying that the basic principles of equality, mutual benefits, and respect for the other side's position must be observed. Persistent efforts are being made to seek the most appropriate solutions. In this connection, the upcoming meeting of the working group for drafting the peace treaty between the Soviet Union and Japan scheduled to open in Tokyo immediately following the Soviet delegation's Japan visit has aroused great attention in our two nations.

As appraised by the Soviet and Japanese participants in this working group, the work carried out by such a working group is the most appropriate gauge because the two sides will be able to have a better understanding of the other side's position and the two nations will be able to jointly seek the orientation for future development. And it also seems very important that the Soviet and Japanese working groups are headed by Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev and Vice Foreign Minister Owada respectively, who have already become intimate friends and who share mutual trust and respect.

In the Soviet Union, very great importance is attached to the work of this working group because through its efforts, our two nations will be able to eventually settle the post-war accounts and sign a peace treaty between the Soviet Union and Japan so that a genuinely firm legal foundation based on a treaty will be established which will ensure smooth development in future Soviet-Japanese relations. With President Gorbachev's official visit to Japan scheduled for next April, work of this working group at the present stage is now all the more meaningful because negotiations on concluding a peace treaty, a major political issue in the Soviet-Japanese relations, have now become an important part of the political dialogue between the Soviet Union and Japan.

The Soviet side has indicated its intention to take cautious but comprehensive and constructive measures while taking each other's legitimate interests into account, and to respect but not ignore realities. We hope that this approach of the Soviet Union will arouse forward-looking reactions of the Japanese side.

'Good Prospects' Seen for Northeast Asian Ties

SK0911130190 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 1 Nov 90

[Unattributed report from the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Excerpts] An international conference has taken place in Ulaanbaatar. The conference was titled: Basic Issues on Cooperation in Northeast Asia and Their Solutions. Our station reporter talked with (Wecheslav Stikov), adviser at the Soviet Embassy in Mongolia, who participated in this conference.

He said: When they assess the political situation in Northeast Asia, people generally point out that affirmative changes are taking place. [passage omitted] Also, dialogue on the Korean peninsula and the establishment of diplomatic relations between Seoul and Moscow were also discussed at the meeting. [passage omitted] I point out that there are factors that hinder international cooperation in Northeast Asia. They are: the Korean question, which remains unresolved; a series of border disputes; the lack of formal relations between Beijing and Seoul, between Tokyo and Pyongyang, and between Pyongyang and Washington; the isolationist policy of the DPRK; social and political developments in Mongolia, the DPRK, and other countries in this region and [word indistinct] of their political structures; and the weak infrastructures in this region. Among them, the issue of how to prevent conflicts on the Korean peninsula is the most acute. The opinion of Scalapino, a renowned U.S. political scholar is interesting. That is that the North and the South must recognize each other and take measures to promote trust; toward this end, forces must be significantly reduced along the border, forces in other areas must also be fundamentally reduced, and [words indistinct]; the two Korean sides must develop economic and cultural exchanges, establish joint-venture companies, and promote the exchange of people; the powers must recognize Pyongyang and Seoul; and the two Koreas must be allowed to enter the United Nations and other international organizations, and the United States must revise its policy toward the Peninsula, reduce its forces based in this area, and the annual "Team Spirit" military exercise must be scaled down. When these political issues are resolved, Northeast Asia will turn into a stage for broad international cooperation in economic and other sectors. Good prospects for development will truly open up. When the abundant natural resources of the Soviet Union, the cheap labor of China and North Korea, and the capital and technology of the developed capitalist countries in this region are combined, prospects will be very bright. [passage omitted]

Near East & South Asia

IZVESTIYA Examines Latest Gulf Developments

PM1211204190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 90 Union Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA PRESS SERVICE report under the rubric: "Panorama of International Life": "Persian Gulf: Bodybags Already Sewn"]

[Text] King Hassan II of Morocco delivered an unexpected statement Sunday proposing the holding of an emergency high-level inter-Arab conference aimed at trying to settle the conflict in the Persian Gulf.

In the speech, broadcast by Moroccan television, the king urged Arab leaders "to give peace one last chance."

However, Iraq rejected this proposal the same day. A statement distributed by the official Iraqi agency INA says that in the current conditions an inter-Arab conference could be "a cover for U.S.-Zionist aggression against Iraq."

Meanwhile PRC Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, who is in Baghdad, held talks with T. 'Aziz, leader of the Iraqi foreign policy department. According to a XINHUA report, the Chinese side again confirmed that it is against "seizures aided by force," but, at the same time, calls for "the solution of disputed issues by peaceful means."

Observers see in this visit "one of the last chances" of searching for a diplomatic solution to the problem. Qian Qichen completed a trip around Near Eastern capitals and in Cairo met with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, discussing with him all the possible ways the situation could develop. In an interview with Egyptian radio the Chinese minister stated: "A war would be a catastrophe not only for this region but also for the whole world."

On this point, the question remains unclear of whether the United States has obtained consent in principle from China to use force against Iraq in the event the UN sanctions do not work.

Nor is there complete clarity in the results of U.S. Secretary of State Baker's visit to France. On the one hand, as our Paris correspondent Yu. Kovalenko writes, the secretary of state stated that there are no "serious differences" between Paris and Washington regarding the crisis in the Persian Gulf region. The two countries' approaches, their aims, and tasks coincide.

But, on the other hand, according to information in the French press, France's position lies in strict observance of the UN Security Council resolutions. In other words, the press indicates, Paris, being in favor of resolving the conflict by diplomatic means, will participate in a war only given the appropriate UN decision.

Nevertheless, Prime Minister M. Rocard stressed that he does not exclude the outbreak of war Husayn's regime. According to a poll, over half the French people consider a military conflict inevitable. And now local newspapers are citing much information about the fact that Paris is already virtually preparing for war. According to data in L'HUMANITE, French units in Saudi Arabia have been given orders to prepare for immediate military action. Several armaments plants have received urgent orders for additional ammunition. All the details have been thought of, including the most ominous—one enterprise is engaged in producing 2,000 bodybags which will be delivered to the conflict area.

The threatening statements of British Defense Minister T. King, who warns that his country intends to send additional military contingents to the Persian Gulf and that Iraq must leave Kuwait "soon" or else be prepared for inevitable war, do not make for optimism either.

But will the UN Security Council agree to give the "green light" to military action—a decision unprecedented in the whole history of the United Nations? U.S. Vice President D. Quayle discussed this possibility in Tokyo with the UN secretary general. An official reporting on this to a UPI correspondent refused to elaborate on what position J. Perez de Cuellar took on this point. But "the degree of accord was striking," he said.

On the other hand, the U.S. magazine NEWSWEEK published a sensational report on G. Bush's readiness to compromise with Iraq. Citing an unnamed high-ranking administration figure, the magazine writes that this compromise would presuppose that Iraq withdraws from Kuwait without prior conditions, but "the United States will not object if after that the Arabs want to satisfy Baghdad's demands by granting it a port in the Persian Gulf or a part of the Kuwaiti oil fields.

If NEWSWEEK's information is correct it will signify a certain deviation by Washington from its previous policy—the demand that the aggression against Kuwait should on no account be "rewarded."

The Baghdad regime meanwhile is also seeking compromises—true, ones that would enable it to look like the victor in Arabs' eyes. In an interview with UK television Saddam Husayn stated: "We are ready to enter into a great dialogue.... Iraq's actions must be considered in the context of overall regional security... If all the interested parties remember this, then they will reach a serious decision on all questions, headed by the Palestinian question."

Many observers think that Husayn's statement is merely the latest attempt to play for time. True, time is certainly not working in Baghdad's favor. New signs have appeared that the UN economic sanctions against Iraq are "biting" harder and harder: New, savage punishments for "grain concealers" have been introduced in the country. According to a REUTER report, there is even talk of the possibility of the death penalty being applied.

PRAVDA Interviews Saudi Prince on Gulf Crisis

PM1111183590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Second Edition p 7

[Interview with Saudi Prince Abdallah Bin Faysal by PRAVDA correspondent V. Belyakov in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia; date not given; published under the rubric: "Guests of Dialogue"; "His Highness"—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Riyadh—I first met Prince Abdallah Bin Faysal, a member of the large Saudi royal family, in March of last year during my first visit to Riyadh. At that time, diplomatic relations between our countries did not exist, and the prince warned me: Our conversation is not for publication. Now he agreed to give an interview.

Abdallah Bin Faysal occupies the post of secretary general of the Royal Commission on Jubayl and Yanb'u. These are two new cities. The first is on the Persian Gulf, the second on the shores of the Red Sea. The major petrochemical complexes built there in recent years form the basis of the Saudi industry. Naturally, our conversation opened with the topic which is closest to the prince's heart.

[Belyakov] Your Highness, Jubayl city is located near the border with occupied Kuwait. Has the crisis which arose as a result of the aggression had a negative impact on the people who live there and the performance of its enterprises?

[Faysal] During the first few days representatives of some foreign companies and a number of foreign workers expressed alarm about their fate. After the landing of U.S. forces on Saudi soil it was their relatives back home who began to express alarm. They were afraid that war would break out. However, when it became clear that the whole world is opposed to the Iraqi aggression and prepared to protect the Kingdom, the alarm began to subside. Meanwhile, the enterprises have been operating normally all this time, and they continue to do so.

[Belyakov] What impact has the crisis had on the Saudi economy?

[Faysal] It has to some extent affected the private sector, where medium-sized enterprises are concentrated. The beginning of the implementation of a number of new economic projects has been delayed and certain business negotiations have been put off until better times. As for major state projects, they continue to be implemented at the former pace.

[Belyakov] How do you rate the prospects of a settlement of the crisis?

[Faysal] Saudi Arabia is hoping for a peaceful settlement, and furthermore for a settlement which would ensure the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait and the Kuwaitis' return home. But although we hope for the best, we are, at the same time, preparing for the worst if a peaceful solution should become deadlocked. In this event the government will seek to minimize the damage which is inevitable during a nonpeaceful settlement of a crisis.

[Belyakov] The world press is full of articles forecasting war. Is this assessment justified?

[Faysal] Iraq is showing no intention of withdrawing from Kuwait without obtaining a reward for its aggression. But the world community cannot permit aggression to benefit anyone. This is what makes many people believe that war is inevitable.

[Belyakov] What can you say in connection with the recent restoration of diplomatic relations between Saudi Arabia and the USSR? What, in your opinion, constitutes specific potential areas of cooperation between our countries in the economic sphere?

[Faysal] The policy which is being implemented by President Gorbachev has induced various countries to strengthen their relations with the USSR, and this is always useful for both sides. I believe that our private sector could play a leading role in Soviet-Saudi economic relations.

The USSR possess a vast scientific and technical potential. However, to ensure further progress the door to the rest of the world should be opened wider.

I believe that an important role in your development could be played by the construction of new, ecologically clean industrial centers on the lines of our Jubayl and Yanb'u. I rate the creation of free trade and economic zones as important. However, their success depends on autonomous administration which is not dependent on government bureaucracy.

The Soviet Union is a great power. The whole world wants to help perestroyka to succeed and we are prepared to contribute our share.

Belyayev Urges Soviet Role as Gulf Mediator

91UF0114A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 44, 31 Oct 90 p 14

[Article by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA political observer Igor Belyayev: "The Actors—On Stage and Behind the Scenes"]

[Text] **If we consider the Persian Gulf region as the stage of the world political theater of our time, then we have just seen the conclusion of the first act of the Kuwaiti drama. In response to Iraq's seizure of Kuwait, a colossal concentration of military power has been concentrated in a confrontation along the Saudi border and in the waters of the gulf.**

We are talking about forces of the United States and almost 30 other states, and the Iraqi Army. And each side—if we are to judge from the statements of U.S. President George Bush and Iraqi President Saddam Husayn—is prepared for the second act. What will it be like?

It is not a simple question, I admit. But it should be answered, in spite of whatever major complexities there may be, before the second act of the Kuwaiti drama unfolds....

President Bush tirelessly emphasizes that Iraq must withdraw unconditionally from Kuwait and comply with all the demands which have been stipulated in UN Security Council resolutions adopted following the Iraqi aggression. One of these is to liberate all foreign hostages seized in Kuwait and Iraq, without exception, and afford them the opportunity to go home. We are talking about the fate of 15,000 people, more or less. For purposes of comparison we recall that just 52 Americans were taken prisoner in Tehran on 4 November 1979, staying 444 days in the occupied U.S. Embassy in Iran which had become their prison....

President Bush has been reminding us more and more frequently in recent days that his patience in awaiting Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait is wearing thin. Such statements mean that the head of the American Government is today leaning not towards a political resolution to the problems engendered by the crisis in the Persian Gulf, but more towards a military strike against Iraq....

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker has also taken up a rigid position. Taking into account the international nature of the anti-Iraq coalition, he intends to present Saddam Husayn an ultimatum—either the Iraqi dictator withdraws unconditionally from Kuwait or... there will be war. The strike against Iraq will be carried out under the UN flag. The present ultimatum will be unusual in form as compared with all other post-war ultimatums of this kind. It should consist of yet another UN Security Council resolution, one which gives the "green light" for "other (i.e., military!) actions" against Iraq. The time frame of the ultimatum, Baker believes, will be eight days. When this time runs out, a strike should take place against the military might of Saddam Husayn....

And so this is how the leaders of the present American administration are disposed. Another two individuals who are part of the administration play an especially important role in the Kuwait drama. I am referring to General Brent Scowcroft, U.S. national security adviser, and the current provisional charge d'affaires at the American Embassy in Baghdad, Joseph Wilson. The former is a veteran in Washington's halls of power. The latter is just 41 years old. Both are resolute in their willingness to act with abandon....

Also expressing their view in recent weeks in favor of a military strike as the only means of resolving the problems in the Persian Gulf region are John Kelly, assistant secretary of state for Near East affairs, and Dennis Ross, a Sovietologist in the State Department who, incidentally, also specializes in the affairs of this region. U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert Cheney is also considered a "hardliner"....

I have enumerated the most important Washington actors in the Kuwaiti drama, people in the "inner circle" of the U.S. President's trusted advisers, with one aim in mind—to show how difficult it is for George Bush, being surrounded by "hawks," to act with restraint. Even if he wanted to. The president's popularity dropped sharply in October, a circumstance which was facilitated to a great degree by U.S. budget problems and an approaching economic recession in America. Apparently, the head of the current administration believes that only military action against Iraq will be able to help correct his shaken predicament.

Well, what do they think about the threatening situation in the Persian Gulf region in Paris, London, and Rome? President F. Mitterand, as we know, proposed a peace initiative in the name of settling the crisis there through political means. This was not supported in the United States and Great Britain. In the meantime he has chosen to bide his time. Italian Prime Minister Andreotti has adopted a similar position. But he can hardly be expected to undertake decisive measures in the name of reducing the level of crisis in the "hot" region....

Head of the British Government Margaret Thatcher is quite resolutely disposed. It would follow from her latest statements that the "iron lady" is against any kind of compromise whatsoever with Saddam Husayn. No negotiations with the dictator! And if he does not rush to withdraw unconditionally from Kuwait, the "Near-East Falklands" may help her emerge victorious in the coming parliamentary elections....

When, in accordance with my old academic habits, I put the words and actions of those fashioning major policy decisions in the United States and the NATO countries into a file sequence, I discovered a trend towards a most dangerous development of events in the Persian Gulf region. War may flare up there in the very near future. And it will comprise the essence of the second act in the drama of Kuwait. Yes—war against the Husayn regime and against the Iraqi president personally. Quite frankly, I shudder at the thought that "dedicated" American and West European statesmen, counting on a war in the region, are not taking into account the innumerable horrors which might rain down on many countries as a result of it, the long-term, destructive danger which awaits mankind on the path to a new world order. Imagine that Saddam Husayn succeeds in firing just one rocket salvo with chemical warheads at Iraq's neighbors. In Saudi Arabia, Mecca and Medina, sites sacred to Islam, might be burned to the ground. Of course the states of the Persian Gulf will suffer. And Jordan....

And it is no accident, it seems, that Israel almost set up secret contacts with Baghdad. Clearly, Tel Aviv fears chemical warfare.

The Soviet Union is also close to the Persian Gulf region. To think, therefore, that an exploding war would pass us by untouched is hardly farsighted. It therefore seems to me that returning today to the outset of events, clarifying who knew what prior to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, are at least non-topical concerns. I am convinced it would be far more beneficial to try to ascertain what Saddam Husayn will do when it becomes convincingly clear to him that he has been chased into a corner. Finding himself in this predicament, the Iraqi president may act in such a way that it becomes a horribly difficult task to overcome the consequences of a war unleashed in the Persian Gulf region.

Saddam Husayn's present situation is critical. Any future move he makes portends no good for his regime. True, today time is still working for the Iraqi president. Perhaps this is why Washington and London are so greatly alarmed at the as yet fruitless economic sanctions against Iraq being carried out on the basis of a UN Security Council resolution. In spite of signs issuing from Baghdad (that food rationing has begun, even that food riots have broken out), collapse of the regime is still a long way off. Nor are there any signs whatsoever of discontent with the dictator among Iraqi generals. Without them, any attempt to incite the Army against Saddam Husayn is doomed to failure. It seems to me that Washington and London—especially in the CIA and SIS (Special Intelligence Services)—have no doubt about this.

Judging from what I have had occasion to observe, the reports of Saddam Husayn's prophetic dream were perceived by us not without some doubt. I think the assertion of the Iraqi president that the Prophet Mohammed (the founder of Islam) visited him in a dream merits attention nonetheless. And the fact that the prophet told Saddam that "Iraqi missiles were aimed in the wrong direction" (i.e., towards Mecca and Medina) and demanded his "withdrawal from Kuwait," leaving behind its several strategically important islands, is no chance occurrence.

There are at least two curious aspects to what occurred. The first might concern Saddam Husayn's probing of possible grounds for political compromise—no matter how unique the form of the probing might seem....

Secondly, the words of the Prophet Mohammed may serve, if not as a directive, then as a desire that Iran not put difficulties in the path of achieving a compromise. The fact of the matter is that Iranian President A.A. Hashemi-Rafsanjani stated recently that his country would impede the augmentation of Iraqi territory at Kuwait's expense.

But if we are talking about compromise, which Saddam Husayn himself called for prior to 2 August 1990, one stake in it, the financial aspect, is familiar to me. During negotiations in Jiddah less than 24 hours before the beginning of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, Izzat Ibrahim, Saddam's representative and deputy chairman of the Revolutionary Command Council, demanded that Crown Prince Sa'd al-'Abdallah Al-Sabah, the Kuwaiti prime minister, agree to pay Iraq $56 billion (!) and "forget" the debt of $13 billion extended to Baghdad during the years of the Iran-Iraq war. Kuwaitis were not prepared to discuss the question of the "gift" and the invasion began just 10 hours later....

I return to the main question—will the war against Iraq, which will possibly break out in November, be simple and short-term? Even in view of all the equipment and technology introduced by the American units comprising the backbone of the anti-Iraq coalition, I think not. Because not a single war in the past has been won as a result of air strikes alone. Secondly, both sides are expecting innumerable casualties, it seems to me. Thirdly, not even Washington has calculated all the political, and especially the ecological consequences of a military flare-up in the Persian Gulf region....

Under the conditions which have taken shape, the role of the Soviet Union in resolving the increasingly exacerbated crisis in the Persian Gulf is unique. Am I perhaps exaggerating? No! Moscow today has a real opportunity to bring peace to the Persian Gulf region through political means. Many people are presently asking—what will be our role in the impending military action against Iraq? It seems to me it would be more correct to phrase the question differently—why should an attempt not be made, with the help of the Soviet Union, to take advantage of all possible opportunities to achieve not war, but peace?

Incidentally, it was noted at the recently conducted Soviet-American meeting of IMEMO [Institute of World Economics and International Relations] of the USSR Academy of Sciences in Moscow (in which not only scholars participated, but also politicians recently occupying high U.S. positions, including in the Reagan administration, and experts in Near East affairs) that it is not at all necessary for us to send troops to Saudi Arabia. It would be so much more significant to utilize our channels of access to Saddam Husayn—in order to convince Iraq's leader of the vital necessity to unconditionally fulfill the demands of the international community as stipulated in resolutions of the UN Security Council.

Under these conditions, it seems to me, the exceedingly difficult but fruitful mission of Yevgeniy Primakov, special representative of the USSR president and member of the USSR Presidential Council, is deserving of special attention. Traveling first to Amman and Baghdad, then to Rome, Paris, Washington, and London, Primakov also went to the area of conflict in the Near East. Just think of the people he has been conversing with, and a great deal becomes clear.

Is war necessary for Saudi Arabia and the United States? I would not be convinced of the correctness of a definitive answer, all the temptation of a destructive strike against Baghdad notwithstanding. And the fact that Saddam Husayn stopped his tanks on the Kuwaiti-Saudi border—although I understand the feeling of Saudi leaders that the crisis has been too protracted—is significant. In particular, the fact that in spite of his numerous threats, the Iraqi president is in no hurry to take the fateful step which might cost him his head....

Status of Soviet Citizens in Iraq Viewed

LD1211130490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Report by Aleksandr Levchenko from Baghdad]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] On the whole, life is virtually unchanged in Baghdad and other Iraqi cities. I tell you this because I wish once again to reassure the relatives of Soviet citizens who are still in Iraq. There is no threat of hunger facing them for at least the next two months. In order to substantiate my assertion, I had a meeting today with (Ivan Koshlev), the counsellor of the Soviet Embassy in Baghdad, and asked him to explain the situation as it currently affects the contracts on which Soviet specialists are working.

[Begin (Koshlev) recording] In recent months the number of Soviet citizens in Iraq has been more than halved. At the moment only 3,500 are still here, working on contracts. During November another 1,000 specialists, approximately, will fly back home. [end recording]

Soviet Muslims Said Volunteering To Fight for Iraq

LD1011202290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2030 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Report by V. Ivanidze, including interview with Ilya D. Ernefas, a poet from Baku from the "Television News Service" program; place and date not given—Ernafas' remarks in Azeri fading into Russian translation]

[Text] [Ivanidze] A weapon in his hands; this man is very gentle and good. He is only 28 years old. However, a decision he recently made cannot be called peaceloving. He decided to become a volunteer in Saddam Husayn's army and go off to Iraq. So what prompted him to this and what idea lay behind this decision?

[Ernefas] President Bush, says Ilya, compares Saddam Husayn with Adolf Hitler. But I believe he should be compared not with Hitler but with that man's predecessor, the renowned Chancellor Bismarck, who united the German lands by fire and the sword. As I see it, under the guise of repulsing Saddam, the idea is arising in the European world of a new crusade against the Muslims. As a Muslim and as a man, I want to counter that danger and take up arms to defend our honor. All the artificial mini-states created in the Orient by the imperialists must perish and Muslims must be united.

[Ivanidze] In the opinion of Mr. Ghalib al-Tamimi, counsellor at Iraq's Embassy in the Soviet Union, the view of the young poet from Baku is somewhat radical. Even so, the Iraqi Embassy has received an enormous number of letters from Soviet people wanting to go off as volunteers to join Saddam Husayn's army. They include military men, one of them being a Russian who described himself as a missile troops veteran, who wants to go to Iraq to fight U.S. imperialism. Mr. Galib al-Timimi, who declined to appear before the camera, told me that the Iraqi people are grateful to these people for their support, but the Iraqi Army has no need of their reinforcement.

West Europe

Gorbachev, FRG's Kohl Meet, Exchange Greetings

LD0911215190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1550 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Text] [no dateline as received] This afternoon Mikhail Gorbachev arrived at the federal chancellery. Before the talks both leaders addressed journalists.

Helmut Kohl said: Dear president, it is a great delight for me to greet you once again. Autumn time is a time for gathering in the harvest. Looking back at the past year, we can tell ourselves that we have done a good job. The important treaty between our two countries, which we are signing today is, on the one hand, a harvest, and on the other the beginning of the road to a good future. Looking back, we can see rises and falls in our joint history, which have brought many tribulations to our peoples. We can look with confidence to a future which, I am convinced, will be a good one. You have contributed greatly to the fact that it will be such. Much of what has occurred during the last year in Germany would have been impossible without your personal active involvement. We value your efforts according to their merit. The fact that you have been granted the Nobel Peace Prize is corroboration of them. Accept our cordial congratulations on this. I am looking forward to our conversations and working talks. I am also looking forward to the hours we will spend in my homeland.

Mikhail Gorbachev said: Esteemed Mr. Chancellor, I would like first of all to agree with you that today sums up the long path which has been traversed by us, our two peoples, our two states, together with other peoples. I am sure that this day will go down in history as the start of new relations between our peoples. The things that we are to do in these two short days will have vast consequences. This has been made possible due to the fact that we now live in a rapidly changing world which is overloaded with problems and worries, in a world in which the strivings of the peoples to live in a better and a different way have been clearly and precisely demonstrated. In this connection, I would like to note that the atmosphere of trust which has come about in relations between our peoples and their politicians is an outstanding achievement. I think that without that, today would not have happened and there would not have been those prospects which we are now opening up. We are getting down to work and I am ready for that. Thank you for your cordiality and hospitality. I would like to shake your hand as a sign of cooperation.

After the exchange of greetings both leaders proceed to Helmut Kohl's office where a one-to-one conversation took place.

Leaders Sign Friendship Treaty, Give Speeches

PRAVDA Notes Gorbachev Speech

PM1211125390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4

[Text of President Mikhail Gorbachev's speech during the signing of the treaty on goodneighbourliness, partnership and cooperation in Bonn on November 9, 1990]

[Text] Respected Federal Chancellor,

Ladies and gentlemen, comrades,

Today is a special day in the age-old history of our countries and, I believe, in the European history.

By signing a document, which it was hard even to imagine a short time ago, we have drawn an official line under an entire historical process and marked a deep perspective which we and you have in common.

The way towards such a treaty is measured not by weeks of text preparation but by years and decades of joint efforts to overcome the past and search for a new quality in relations between the Soviet Union and Germany.

It is with deep satisfaction that I note Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl's substantial contribution to this great cause: During our first contacts we arrived at the conclusion that relations between our peoples were ripe for thorough changes.

At this moment, I would like to pay tribute to the initiators and architects of the "Ostpolitik", and first of all to Mr. Willy Brandt and Mr. Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

We responded to the call of the times, we received it on the eve of a new century as a duty before our own nations and before Europe as a whole.

We would have been unable to begin to act if we had not been satisfied that lessons, stemming from the 20th century's tragic past history, have been learned and have taken deep root in consciousness and political life.

I must say that we would not have succeeded if substantial improvements had not occurred by that time in Soviet-American relations.

We also pay their due in this respect to France and Great Britain, their peoples and governments.

Progress was accelerated due to the stormy processes of internal transformations in East Germany, which destroyed the wall that separated the German nation. There should be no period of uncertainty and vagueness between the realisation of the will of Germans for unification and the transition to a new level of Soviet-German relations.

This was realised in good time by responsible politicians on all three sides, who had, from the very outset, to regulate this process on principles of peace and concord.

It is very important that the treaty of good-neighbourliness, partnership and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany was drawn up together with the treaty on the final settlement around Germany, signed in Moscow two months ago.

I am confident that we made the only right choice. We made a deeply thought-out decision consistent with the long-term vital interests and the time-honoured tradition of both our nations and states.

I am also confident that the big—as it has already been described—Soviet-German treaty will not be an isolated episode but a constant component of a new peaceful order which is being created by the efforts of all participants in the European-scale process.

The Soviet-German treaty is not directed against anyone. Our concord and cooperation make parts of the load-carrying structures of the common European home, in which security for each will mean security for all, and in which universal human values and the spirit of respect, solidarity and good-neighborliness will triumph.

Our treaty does not stand in isolation. The Soviet Union has recently signed a treaty of friendship and cooperation with France and a political declaration of cooperation with Spain, and earlier with Finland and Italy, with which, incidentally, an agreement had been reached to sign a treaty of friendship and cooperation.

It seems we are not far away from reaching an agreement on signing a Soviet-British declaration.

All these acts, as well as other potential bilateral agreements organically fit into the building of common European structures, which await approval at the forthcoming Paris summit, a truly epoch-making event.

Addressing citizens of the united Germany today, I want to stress once again the significance of what is taking place for all of us.

A new vision of the world is triumphant.

The epoch of confrontation is over.

The image of Europe and the world is changing.

Our treaty is a strong and healthy child of all these changes. As it matures and gains strength, it will play an ever greater role in the lives of our nations and in the entire European development in keeping with criteria of a new epoch.

Goethe's prophetic words "mankind is above nations" are being filled nowadays with concrete political substance.

Our treaty is remarkable for the clarity of positions and intentions, its orientation towards the future and openness to all who want to take part in building a new Europe on a new basis.

Let us, without delay and doubt, make good-neighbourliness, partnership and cooperation a daily, habitual thing in the communication between our great nations.

May the Soviet-German treaty, concluded for twenty years, turn into a treatise on "eternal peace".

Thank you.

Kohl Speech

LD0911232390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1715 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Speech by FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl at signing of treaty with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev in Bonn prior to news conference—live; in German with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] We have gathered together here at the Schaumburg Palace to mark the culmination of your visit together. We are signing the first founding political treaty concluded by a united Germany, a treaty on good-neighborly relations, partnership and cooperation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union. We have chosen for this a worthy setting reflecting the constancy of our relations. Here, in this hall, stood the federal cabinet desk from the middle of 1950. Here, in 1955, under our first federal chancellor, Konrad Adenauer, the decision was made to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. And in 1970, under Federal Chancellor Brandt, the Moscow Treaty was adopted.

The all-embracing treaty we are signing now superbly embodies our political will. First, we are drawing a line beneath an agonizing chapter of the past and we are opening up the way to a new start. In so doing, we are continuing the good traditions of many centuries of our peoples' common history. Second, we are opening up the way to broad cooperation between our states, thereby endowing their relations with new qualities in the interests of our peoples and in the interests of peace in Europe. Third, we are reaching mutual understanding of the fact that together we are tackling big challenges on the threshold of the third millenium. We want to avoid any war, whether it be nuclear or conventional.

We want to preserve and consolidate peace. We want to uphold the priority of international law in domestic and international politics. We want to contribute to the cause of ensuring the survival of mankind and, of course, to the conservation of the natural environment. We want, first and foremost, to place man with his individual worth and his rights at the center of our policy. Our treaty translates these lofty goals into specific obligations: respect for the territorial integrity of all the states of Europe, a renunciation of the use of force or threat of force, the peaceful settlement of conflicts, non-aggression, disarmament and arms control, as well as intensive and comprehensive consultations.

Set against the process of reform in your country, our economic and scientific cooperation is of outstanding significance. This is also emphasized by the treaty on the development of widescale cooperation in the sphere of the economy, industry, science, and technology, which is being signed today. The treaty represents a framework in international law for the fact that a united Germany, as a member of the European Community, will be one of the Soviet Union's largest economic partners. A new treaty-based foundation will also be laid today for our cooperation in the sphere of labor and social security.

Mr. President, I am also deeply satisfied at the fact that our comprehensive treaty is addressed to the people and to all of our citizens as well. It clears the way for holding meetings between people on a broad basis, in particular among young people, and it clears the way for more intensive cultural exchange. It will enable Soviet citizens of German nationality to preserve their language, culture, and traditions. It will give us an opportunity to help them in this. And, not least, our treaty meets the profoundly humane desire to visit the graves of the dead and to tend them, wherever they are to be found. Thus, the treaty is not just the expression of a broad understanding between our states and governments, but also an appeal to all our citizens to play their part in the business of reconciling our peoples. However, Mr. President, the treaty does not just deal with a settlement with regard to Germany. We are installing another cornerstone in the creation of a peaceful system in Europe. We are pleased with the treaty which the Soviet Union has just signed with France, and which is geared to the same ends, and also with the treaties it is yet to sign with other West European partners.

In 10 days time, further historic documents, which will advance the process of disarmament and confidence building throughout Europe, and which will create all-embracing security structures, will be signed at the Paris CSCE summit. In other words, we are following a good path toward a Europe of peace, good-neighborliness, partnership, and cooperation. This is the spirit, Mr. President, in which we want to sign this treaty.

Leaders Interviewed

LD1011003590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2303 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Interview with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl by unidentified German correspondent at treaty signing in Bonn on 9 November; from the "VID" "View (Vzglyad) and Others" program—recorded; Kohl and correspondent speak in German with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Correspondent] Mr. President, you and the Federal Chancellor are striving to create the new foundations for relations between our countries, to make them richer. Will these efforts be fully supported in your country? Or do you expect criticism?

[Gorbachev] I am confident that the things which have been happening in recent years in relations between our peoples—and my confidence is based, naturally, on knowledge of the situation—meet with approval in the Soviet Union, the approval of the majority of our people. After all, our people have also cooperated even in the past with both the Germans of the FRG, who have been our biggest partners among the Western countries, and with the Germans of the GDR, who have been our main partner among the East European countries. It would be strange and incomprehensible if these relations, under the new conditions, under more favorable conditions, were suddenly to start contracting now.

No, I want to say that our people wish to continue cooperating. We have traversed a long road and reached the point where today we can feel ourselves to be partners and can act precisely in this spirit. I am confident that the policy which has been worked out on the basis of cooperation between our governments and which expresses the views and moods of our people, will meet with approval.

I do not think that this turn of events, which is linked to big changes, which opens a new chapter or even an entire epoch in the development of our relations, as far as political, economic, and scientific relations, and even the sphere of security are concerned—I do not think it will pass unnoticed. No, it is already arousing interest and questions. That will all happen. But that does not change the main thing. Our people favor the utmost development of partnership and good-neighborly relations, in the spirit of the best traditions, so that oppressive memories in the history of our relations can be consigned to the past forever. I believe that years of cooperation await us, in the interests of our two countries and peoples.

[Correspondent] Mr. Chancellor, during the talks you expressed the opinion that aid will be given not only to the Soviet Union but also to other East European countries. Is there not the danger that we may overexert ourselves?

[Kohl] I do not think that this can happen. Over the last 40 years much money has been consumed by the cold war, the arms race, and many other processes that we do not need now. Now we are financing peace and cooperation and friendship between our peoples. This is money well-invested. However, your question can be directed not only to the Germans but also to the seven industrially developed states, to the European Community. I consider that the very situation that has arisen at the end of this year linked to the dramatic events in the Persian Gulf region has shown what significance oneness, the unity of the civilized world, has and the value of mutual aid.

The Soviet Union is our most important neighbor in Eastern Europe. Good relations with the Soviet Union are important for the whole of Europe and not only for our peoples. I repeat that these are investments in the peace process. If little saplings are not cared for as they should be, they will not grow into a forest.

Gorbachev, Kohl Hold News Conference 10 Nov

LD1011005290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1715 GMT 10 Nov 90

[News conference with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl in Schaumberg Palace in Bonn—live; Kohl speaks in German with simultaneous Russian translation]

[Text] [Moderator] Ladies and Gentlemen! I am opening this news conference. To start with, the federal chancellor and the president will set out briefly the content of their talks. There will be a total of 35 minutes at your disposal. Mr. Federal Chancellor, you have the floor!

[Kohl] Mr. President! Your Excellency! Esteemed Ladies and Gentlemen! Your present visit, Mr. President, is a landmark in relations between our peoples and countries. I think that the significance of this day is extremely great. You are the first head of a foreign state to visit the united Germany. Exactly one year ago today, the Berlin Wall fell and that makes our meeting politically symbolic.

United Germany is concluding its first foreign policy treaty, which we have just signed, on good-neighborliness, partnership, and cooperation, with your country, with the Soviet Union. Parallel with this, we have signed a treaty on all-embracing economic cooperation. This has determined our talks which we held today before dinner and those which we had with you in summer in the Caucasus and at the beginning of the year in Moscow.

I thank you, Mr. President, for the decisive contribution to the fact that Germany, our fatherland, was able to arrive at unification on 3 October in peace and freedom and in good-neighborliness with all of our neighbors. We talked to you today about our future cooperation, primarily in the field of the economy, and we reached unity. with you on the fact that the reforms which are taking place in the Soviet Union in the economic field must be supported by us through advice and deeds, and we will do this both within the relations between Germany and the Soviet Union and also everywhere we participate on a multilateral basis.

This path, in the view of the Federal Government, must be supported by the group, by discussion within the group of high-level experts which the Federal Government—I am replying to your proposal—it will be discussed within its framework.

I have agreed with you, Mr. President, that the program of broad exchanges that we have begun and about which we agreed in October of last year concerning raising qualifications and retraining professional workers and young people must be taken further and continued into the future.

We have agreed specific measures with the Soviet Union in order that the housing program we have proposed for servicemen and their families returning to the Soviet Union can be begun quickly and effectively.

I spoke especially about the Soviet Germans and think that the treaty that we have signed ensures for these people the right to their language, their culture, to their preservation and maintenance. We want to help them in this. And within the framework of what is possible we would like to ease their living conditions in their homeland, their present homeland.

We also discussed and our attention focused on the developments in the Persian Gulf. We noted with great concern that the Iraqi leadership is continuing to refuse to fulfill the demands of the international public that all hostages be released and that it immediately leave Kuwait.

The broad international solidarity directed against the violence and aggression that was expressed in the Security Council resolution gives us grounds to call this a courageous reaction. The Security Council and particularly its permanent members must continue their line and reinforce it.

Mr. Gorbachev and I continued what was begun in the course of our two meetings in Moscow and in the Caucasus during the summer. We conducted our talks in the same open and, I would emphasize, friendly atmosphere, and I hope that we accomplished good work in Bonn today. It is true and important to stress that we trust each other, and this has been confirmed.

[Gorbachev] I share the chancellor's assessment of the unique nature of the moment, and I wish to say that this was a central theme in my present dialogue with Mr. Kohl. We did not waste time on approaches, on feeling out positions. A great deal is clear to us. Recently we have been cooperating fruitfully and effectively, and we have been prepared to find the correct responses to the challenges of the time. These challenges are enormous, and they are accompanied by great changes, not only in relations between our peoples, but also in Europe and in the world.

At the signing of the treaty and in our exchange of opinions, we stressed that what is taking place today, on this day, is of enormous historical significance in the destiny of the German nation. It is of enormous significance in the history of Soviet-German relations and in Europe as a whole. We can see a new role for our two great peoples and states in this rapidly changing world, which contains both great possibilities for restructuring international relations in a spirit of the challenge of the time, but also dangers, for every sharp turn involves risk. The chancellor and I devoted a great deal of attention to this. This is why, without lingering, without even waiting for today or for the completion of the unification process in Germany, we have already, within the framework of political discussions and an exchange of opinions between the leadership of the Soviet Union and the former FRG, found it necessary and possible to embark upon the preparation of new and fundamental legal acts to regulate our relations and to comprise a legal basis for these relations at the new stage of the development of Germany, the Soviet Union, and Europe.

That is why we were able today—to the satisfaction, I hope, not only of the peoples of the Soviet Union, of the Germans of Germany, and already of a united Germany, but also to the satisfaction of Europeans and of the entire world community—to sign these very important documents. They open a new page in our relations, and they do this not only in that they contain important political statements, but also very tempting goals for our two peoples and states, and they contain the mechanisms for realizing and achieving these goals. Therefore, it is a good thing that today, along with the Grand Treaty—as we have called the Treaty of Good-Neighbourliness, Partnership, and Cooperation—a treaty of cooperation in the sphere of science, technology, and culture was signed simultaneously. This is already the realization of the political aims of this Grand Treaty. Within the framework of this, the chancellor and I have already been able to discuss a great deal in practical terms about our economic cooperation.

Mr. Chancellor showed great interest in how perestroyka is proceeding, where we are, and what the features are of the present stage. He received on this, I hope, exhaustive answers, but if some questions still remain, we have still have a day ahead of us, and I will try to fill in what was not answered during the two meetings we have had already.

We discussed our unique relations also in the sense that a large group of Soviet troops will remain on German territory for a certain time. On behalf of our people and our country's government, I stated that we highly assess the position of the president, Mr. von Weiszaecker, of Chancellor Kohl, of Mr. Genscher—a position, which, as they prsented it themselves, consists herein that they have called on the German people to regard the Soviet soldiers who are here because of certain decisions and treaties as representatives of a friendly army.

We—perhaps I am not conveying the words precisely—but the sense is exactly that.

Our public opinion has a high regard for this. We discussed what sort of economic ties we should have in the immediate future, in the early medium-term, and in the long-term. We found it necessary to go more deeply into practical work in all these directions. In connection with this, exchanges will take place and will continue, though they have also been taking place during the past few days. We have, I think, an understanding of the main issues relating to the upcoming European Community session in Rome. We did agree to amplify and do more work on a number of issues.

I shall not complicate the list of what we talked about any more. I shall merely add that, as Mr. Kohl has already said, we devoted considerable time to an analysis of the situation in the Persian Gulf. I have already spoken about this question on a number of occasions recently. I would like to say yet again, in connection with the talks with Mr. Kohl, that we have an understanding of the fact that we are all—the world community and community of nations—basically undergoing a test. The new policy is also undergoing a test. We have left the cold war behind, as well as the instruments used during that period for solving international problems. We are seeking new political approaches for resolving everything which has been left to us as a legacy, and for resolving problems which could arise in the new stage. In this connection we consider that we must act firmly and consistently in the spirit of the views of the organization, and the decisions adopted by the United Nations Organization and the Security Council.

Let nobody count on splitting, driving a wedge into, or upsetting this unity. If we turn out to be incapable of acting in the new peaceful period, of solving problems which arise, this will threaten us with very serious consequences. We must be united. Such was the theme of the exchange of views. As far as the details are concerned, I consider that they are not so important.

[Moderator] We can start questions. Please, Viktor Lyubovtsev, Central Television.

[Lyubovtsev] My question is addressed to both the president and the chancellor. You noted today primarily the political significance of the treaties you have signed. What is the human dimension of this document, for you personally, and for the peoples of both our countries, which remember not only the bright but also the bitter pages of history? Thank you.

[Kohl] The document is very all-embracing indeed. It regulates virtually all spheres, touches upon all spheres of the cohabitation of our peoples. If I now just recall the talks we had at to the beginning of our relations, namely the meetings in Mr. President's homeland—the last was in the Caucasus—and if I were to permit myself to speak on behalf of both of us, we found it very important that we represent one generation. We were children, we were nine, 10, or 11 years old, we lived through the beginning of the war, and wartime.

I very well recall when you and I met, Mr. President, and had meetings with the population where you were secretary of the party organization. I recall how war veterans came up to us and said: You are doing a good thing, just take care that what happened to us never happens to the generations of our grandchildren.

In these simple words of eldery people probably 70 or 75 years of age, a whole program was described in these words. And what a wise text. One could say that no legal document could better describe what we want to do together. We felt that for us this was a great, important day. I hope that this will be so for people both in the Soviet Union and in Germany.

[Gorbachev] I must say that everything the chancellor and I, that both of our governments, the governments of our states, have jointly done in recent years has been done with a sense of responsibility and understanding of the uniqueness of our history and the history of our relations. That has always been present. It was also present today.

[Unidentified speaker in German] Just a moment please.

[Gorbachev] Is everything all right? May I continue?

[Unidentified speaker in English] OK.

[Gorbachev] In that case I shall repeat what I said, for those who understood [the preceding exchange].

I want to say the following in answer to the question that was asked. Everything Mr. Kohl and I have done, together with the governments of our two countries, in recent years, has always been done with a sense of responsibility. We were always mindful of the uniqueness of our common history, the history of our relations. We have been mindful of all the bright things that there have been in this history, the tradition whose roots go back many centuries—and there have been such things. But we never forgot, and today's talks were no exception, the difficult period connected with the war. The chancellor touched on this. Yes, in recent decades, both sides have done a great deal to enable us to emerge, to reach the present day, and to achieve the relations we now have. This is evidence of the greatness of our peoples, of their wisdom, of the great store of humanism. But—and this was also present today—we cannot forget how dearly both our peoples paid for the war fascism drew us into, pushed us into.

We should say today that there would have been no process of unification, and certainly not today's treaties of course, had the Germans, first and foremost, not been the first to draw their own conclusions from the lessons of a grave period of their history, to embody these conclusions in fresh visions, and to embody these conclusions in new forms of relations with other peoples. This we welcome, and we pay due tribute to the German people. I am proud that our people bore all the burdens of that war, suffering the most heavy losses. These losses are such that according to the latest data today—the precise figures are still being adjusted—we lost somewhere around 26 million Soviet citizens in that war. Our people found within themselves the strength to rebuild their country, to return it to life, and to propose fresh initiatives to the world to move away from confrontation and the cold war toward cooperation between all peoples.

We attach immense importance to the relations between our peoples. The statement of the new realities and what is enshrined in these documents that Mr. Chancellor and I signed today are confirmation that both our peoples and governments, covering the whole of this path, are ready to act in a spirit of cooperation, partnership, good-neighbourliness—and we do not hide that today we said—to advance toward a very broad cooperation between our peoples, strengthening trust, and constructing a building of friendship between our peoples. This is a great aim. I think that this will yield splendid fruits for our two countries, for Europe, and for the world.

[Moderator] The next question will be from Mr. Putz. Please use the microphone.

[Putz] Mr. Federal Chancellor, why has the third agreement on sociopolitical cooperation not been signed as planned?

[Moderator] Mr. [Norbert] Bluem [FRG minister of labour and social affairs], please answer that question.

[Unidentified interpreter] Mr. Bluem does not have a microphone. It has been signed, Mr. Klein [chief FRG Government spokesman] has replied.

[Marsh, in English with superimposed Russian translation] David Marsh: A question for President Gorbachev. Mr. Gorbachev, you said today in your speech, which has already been distributed, that the Germans and the Soviet Union are no longer military opponents. Who, in that case, are your potential military opponents, if you have such opponents at all today?

[Gorbachev] We proceed from the view that today a unique opportunity has been opened for all of us to build new international relations on the basis of disarmament, which happily did not come to a halt at the first stage, but is now embarking on the second stage. Work in Vienna is already effectively coming to an end, should I say is practically already finished in the main. I should add here that the talks on a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive weapons are proceeding successfully and are also close to completion. This indicates profound changes in the policy of the main protagonists in the world arena, including the military powers, and this policy, I hope, reflects the fundamental interests and changes that have occurred in the mood of the world community and of all peoples.

I see no opponents whom we would suspect, in any particular country or among any particular people, of preparing for war against us. That is the way we understand today's world. On the basis of this analysis we have adopted a defensive doctrine which has been followed by a restructuring of the USSR Armed Forces. We are on the eve of a profound reform of the Armed Forces, it has already been submitted to the government, and will then be submitted to the Supreme Soviet. Army General Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, is present here; he is nodding in confirmation that the information I am giving corresponds to reality. This is how we regard today's world, and it permits us to hope that we have correctly put forward and set ourselves the goal of proceeding to a nuclear-free, nonviolent world as the greatest goal for the whole world community.

We have too many other problems to exhaust ourselves in the arms race, which did nothing but poison relations—relations we must now restore—and which ruined even such rich countries as the Soviet Union and the United States. It ruined them in the sense that it had a negative effect on the development of these countries. That is a direct reply to your direct question.

[Moderator] Thank you. A question from the United States, I understand?

[CBS Television correspondent, in English with simultaneous Russian translation] A question from American CBS television news, a question for President Gorbachev: Yesterday Mr. Shevardnadze, discussing the possible use of force in the Persian Gulf region, said, and I quote, the use of force cannot be ruled out if there is a situation that effectively requires such a step. I have two questions: First, in what situation will the Soviet Union approve the use of force? And second, in what situation will you, Mr. Gorbachev, deem it possible to dispatch troops to assist those troops now deployed there? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] I think that everything we have done so far, acting jointly within the framework of the UN Security Council, is an enormous victory. Perhaps this will seem strange to you, but I insist upon precisely this. In the first place, for the first time perhaps even in history and not just in postwar history, we are acting together in this acute situation in a spirit of unity and an understanding of the responsibility to the world community within the framework of the United Nations Organization, which has been created for this purpose, in order to protect and to preserve this peace.

We have condemned the aggressor. We have taken resolute measures and we are implementing them. And all attempts to shatter this unity have failed, and they are doomed in the future, too. Finally, we are preserving peace. This region, which is a source of energy for the world economy, is functioning, and that means the world economy is functioning in the interests of the whole world community. Therefore, this is an important victory for the United Nations.

Further, I consider that the United Nations, using its resources, will decide how to act in the future. We will not engage in planning operations of whatever kind with you now. I think the United Nations Organization, cooperating and analyzing, will act consistently. One thing is clear to me: The resolution of those decisions adopted by the United Nations Organization will be ensured and achieved.

[Moderator] Thank you very much.

[Unidentified correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich and Mr. Kohl. Over the past decades, the USSR and the GDR formed solid and multifaceted relations. Do you think the treaty signed by you today will ensure the preservation and development of relations between the USSR and the eastern part of a united Germany? Are there any guarantees that the solid capital accumulated here will not be wasted?

[Gorbachev] The impression I get is that the apprehensions you have expressed are to a considerable degree eliminated by the treaties and documents which we have signed so far, by the accords which have been attained at the political and summit level, which set out the fact that we must reckon with the realities and act in a way to make the relations that have existed until now indeed serve as a good little bridge for developing and broadening our relations with all Germany. Perhaps one should not say that everything is to stay the way it was. Changes are already taking place within the framework of a united Germany. Nevertheless, I must make public the chancellor's assurances—and the documents also reflect this—that the combined nation will promote in every possible way the preservation of these multifaceted relations; moreover, it is necessary to use them now in the interests of developing our relations with a united Germany as a whole.

I intend to address this topic in my speech at the dinner. I hope the dinner is going to take place, Mr. Chancellor! [laughter]

[Kohl] Yes, Mr. President, we agreed this would be the last question. But I would also like to reply to it. It is a fundamental question. And I would like to say from the start that I hold the view that the situation for the Soviet Union regarding economic and trade relations with the united Germany are improving, and I do not think, with regard to these economic relations, that we could not [as heard] have achieved such an improvement under the former circumstances. Why is that? The Soviet Union's economic and trade relations with the united Germany are at the same time relations with a country that is one of the most important countries in the European Community. The European Community, and this is quite evident, will assume additional economic dynamism in the near future. In two years, that is in 1992, a large, immense market will emerge which will have no internal borders and in which several hundreds of millions of people will live, and this will bring about an intensification of economic relations. In reply to your question, I would like to say that it will lead to an intensification of relations between the Soviet Union and the European Community.

We can facilitate precisely this to a considerable degree. And I welcome this. I should like to say very clearly: We do not want this treaty we signed today, the so-called Grand Treaty, and other treaties too, to remain merely paper. We want to breathe life into these treaties. I want to make every possible contribution toward ensuring the Federal Republic of Germany regards this treaty as one that goes beyond the purview of the current government and toward helping the policy of reforms in the Soviet Union, the policy which is connected with the name of the Soviet Union to be crowned with success. We do not wish to limit ourselves to the present day alone; we want to show clearly that this is an opportunity for peace in Europe. Everything that promotes peace in Europe goes beyond the bounds and problems of that region alone. The world has become more closely interconnected.

Answering a question of the conflict with regard to Iraq, Mr. Gorbachev said that a few years ago such a situation would have been impossible—and just look how far we have come over these years. Thank goodness! And, as for your question, I think I can tell you the following: We shall of course encounter details and problems, since the matters involved are rather complex. But I must say that we, the Federal Government, the Federal Republic, want to proceed along this road and to go farther; we are in favor of intensifying relations in all spheres, in economic policy as a whole, in matters of cultural exchange, research and technology, and youth exchanges. Every sphere, [including] science, every sphere of human activity bears and opens a new chapter of history. In this sense, I regard this as a good day.

Thank you, the news conference is closed.

Soviet, FRG Leaders Visit German Cities 10 Nov

Arrive in Rheinland-Pfalz

LD1011125490 Moscow TASS in English 1235 GMT 10 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondents Lev Volnukhin, Sergey Sosnovskiy and Viktor Chistyakov]

[Text] Bonn November 10 TASS—After political talks in Bonn, President Mikhail Gorbachev arrived in Speier by helicopter today. This is one of the most ancient cities of the Rheinland-Pfalz land, a major cultural and scientific centre of the region. The Soviet guest is accompanied by Chancellor Helmuth Kohl.

Hundreds of people gathered in the central square of the city to welcome Gorbachev in spite of foul weather. The square was decked with national flags of the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. President Gorbachev and Raisa Gorbachev were met with cheers and applause. In violation of the official protocol, Gorbachev chatted with the people welcoming him and replied to their questions.

The Soviet guests visited the Speier imperial cathedral, built almost a thousand years ago, which is the pride of this city.

After the cathedral, Mikhail Gorbachev and Helmuth Kohl continued the sightseeing tour of Rheinland-Pfalz.

Address Deidesheim Residents

LD1011171490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1516 GMT 10 Oct 90

[Report by TASS correspondents Lev Volnukhin, Sergey Sosnovskiy, and Viktor Chistyakov]

[Text][Excerpt] Bonn 10 Nov (TASS)—[passage omitted] Addressing Deidesheim residents in a short speech of greetings, Mikhail Gorbachev said that he is pleased to be in Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl's homeland, which is closely bound up with the history of the German people. We are very moved by your hospitality and cordiality. The Soviet Union wants to cooperate with the great German people and to solve together the problems time has set before us.

Yesterday, the president continued, was a great day: very important documents were signed. The federal chancellor, with whom I have established relations of trust and cooperation, and I are striving to act in such a way that the reborn united Germany and the people of the Soviet Union as they deal with perestroyka might turn to face the individual. We want our peoples to pool their efforts and build new relations between our great countries in the interests of all the peoples of Europe and the whole world.

The documents that have been signed look to the future. You will have, in the Soviet people, a reliable partner. Decades have passed, in which we endeavored to understand the difficult pages of our history. Now we are doing a great deal so that we can go forward together.

On behalf of the Soviet people, Mikhail Gorbachev wished the people of united Germany success in what they do and, quite simply, human happiness.

In his reply, Helmut Kohl noted that the German-Soviet documents signed the day before are of great significance. But no less important is the fact that they should be consolidated not just on paper but in people's hearts. This is something of which I am particularly aware in my homeland.

Addressing the USSR president, Helmut Kohl said: The road to German unity was a hard one. But all the time we could sense your help and support. The German people are grateful to you for that. A friend in need is a friend indeed. It is the Soviet Union that is now living through a difficult period as it implements major reforms, as it implements perestroyka. You know, however, that you have many friends in Germany and to the best of their ability they will provide you with assistance.

Gorbachev Meets With Genscher, FRG Politicians

PM1311095190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meetings on German Soil"]

[Text] 11 Nov—On the morning of 10 November USSR President M.S. Gorbachev met with FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher—one of the figures whose consistency and principledness on questions of German-Soviet rapprochement has made it possible to achieve such substantial and promising results. They are now summed up in the "big treaty" and are the natural result, it was stressed in the conversation, of the fact that from the outset German unification was conceived and built in the context of the all-European process.

Now we can note, M.S. Gorbachev said, the "defeat" of the bloc logic which led Europe to a very dangerous borderline.

During the exchange of opinions on the destiny of the East European countries the view was resolutely rejected that the profound internal changes here have harmed the all-European cause. On the contrary, the unconditional assertion of the Helsinki principles in relations between all European peoples increases the potential of the European process. And it is particularly important to see this on the threshold of the Paris summit meeting. This meeting would not fulfill its role if it restricted itself to proclaiming ideas and intentions. The new stage which it opens up should be distinguished by the existence of international political structures and institutions capable of ensuring the actual formation of an economic, cultural, ecological, technical, and information space. No one intends to force on this development artificially. But it is this development which could also exert fruitful influence on internal processes in a number of countries, protecting them from dangerous eruptions on the soil of nationalism and separatism. The internal instability in individual countries could become the source of international instability. The prevention of "Balkanization" and especially of "Lebanization" in Europe should be a general concern.

The Paris meeting is also of enormous importance in this sense. Europe should become the joint habitation of sovereign states with mutual openness and diversity in their cooperation—these are two processes which balance each other.

The absolutization of sovereignty is alienation from historical and present-day realities which could cost the peoples dear. It is already being refuted by the attainments of West European integration. The sovereign peoples are in need of organic cooperation—without any politics mongering and fuss in this extraordinarily crucial matter.

The stormy process of each country's search for its place is now under way, M.S. Gorbachev stressed. But this search is fruitful when understanding the importance of the peoples' joint existence and not on the paths of isolation. Each people, if the all-European process proceeds normally, will have the entire potential of Europe.

In the context of this approach toward the European process from the Atlantic to the Urals, and inasmuch as it is a case of the Soviet Union it is natural to include its entire territory, any form of encouragement of separatist tendencies and of setting some people against others is unacceptable. Claims to territorial repartition should be ruled out. Things only have to be started here for a reverse process to proceed destructively, casting back to times already known to its history.

E.A. Shevardnadze and O. Lambsdorff took part in the thorough, friendly talk.

The friendly talk with the SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany] chairman and the party's candidate for chancellor—the leaders of the German Social Democrats—was a continuation of the long-standing dialogue between the CPSU and the SPD which for nearly two decades now has been making a constructive contribution to Soviet-German relations.

The initiatives of Willy Brandt and other figures of the SPD and their role in implementing the "Ostpolitik" are a historical service which can never be questioned. Their consistency in achieving mutual understanding and overcoming the legacy of the war—whether as the government party or in opposition—is an inalienble part of the process which has led to the present results in Soviet-German relations.

The range of ties with the German social democrats has constantly expanded. It now also encompasses problems like the present content of the socialist idea. The experience of the two countries, European experience, and the entire development of civilization should be included in today's reading of the socialist idea. That requires the intensification of contacts between its champions in different countries. The contribution of Soviet-German dialogue to this theme could be particularly significance. It is a case not of inventing artificial new schemes but of the joint analysis of realities and the study of options for development depending on specific conditions.

M.S. Gorbachev expressed satisfaction at cooperation with the German Social Democrats as reliable partners in the common matter of European building. In turn H.-J. Vogel and O. Lafontaine confirmed their party's resolve to take an active part implementing the ideas and provisions of the "big treaty."

The Social Democrats' desire to assist Soviet perestroyka led to talk about the maintenance of the solidarity so necessary to the Soviet people now. All agree that it cannot be restricted to advice and words of approval. Solidarity, M.S. Gorbachev noted, is of course important in the sense of direct economic report. But an understanding of the fact that such a profound revolutionary process in such a country cannot be painless is also important. It makes it possible to avoid hasty conclusions and becoming captive to opportunist, panicky deductions regarding perestroyka emanating, among other sources, from some politicians in the Soviet Union itself. These assessments are not harmless on the practical plane either, inasmuch as they give rise among some people abroad to doubts and dampen the ardor of those who have the resources to render us real assistance at the particularly difficult transitional stage.

An enormous chance is being opened up for historically large-scale Soviet-German cooperation geared to many decades. And "investments" in perestroyka made now will be more than justified and directly so for those who display boldness and breadth of vision and for their countries and the entire world community.

There was a discussion of the situation in the Persian Gulf. M.S. Gorbachev set forth his well-known dialectic approach toward the problem of eliminating the crisis in accordance with the criteria of international relations of the new period.

V.M. Falin and the president's aides took part in the talk.

On 10 November M.S. Gorbachev met with FRG Finance Minister Theodor Waigel, chairman of the CSU [Christian Social Union]—a party which is taking a vigorous part in the development of Soviet-German relations at their new stage.

The interlocutors recalled Franz-Josef Strauss—a major politician who saw far ahead and did quite a lot to elaborate approaches toward Soviet-German cooperation and the overcoming of the legacy of the war. What he thought of when he left behind his own prejudices is now being implemented.

In this connection talk turned to the topic of the pace of historical development. Their present swiftness, M.S. Gorbachev noted, was preceded by a long period of accumulation of knowledge of each other and of the surrounding world. And it has been affirmed uet again that not only are we making history but history is also changing us. As a result the factor that is trust has formed, a factor which can ensure the truly widescale development of Soviet-German relations. Cooperation between Germany and the Soviet Union has a tremendous future—if we do not succumb to considerations of expediency and if we constantly recall the colossal resources which both nations and two such countries possess.

From the viewpoint of the size of the wealth which could be created during this cooperation to the benefit of both peoples and international progress, the sum which the Soviet Union needs to overcome its special difficulties in the transition to new economic forms seems immeasurably insignificant. He who invests in perestroyka now at its present most crucial stage, M.S. Gorbachev is noted, is thinking in truly historical terms. That is why I assess highly the position of the chancellor and the position of the finance minister of the FRG.... Despite the fact that his very post "obliges him to be attentive."

Enormous achievements await us, the Soviet Union and Germany, because it is hard to find a more felicitous combination of different elements—economic, intellectual, historical, geographical, and others—which could interact to produce unusually powerful results. And we cannot allow ourselves to become hostage to speculative arguments about the "collapse" of the Soviet Union and the "irreconcilability" of the power of the center and the republics' sovereignty, and so forth.

During the talk a high assessment was given of the fact that the agreement on transitional measures was signed by the FRG finance minister. This document itself is an important practical contribution to conciliation between the two peoples.

T. Waigel imparted his specific ideas for organizing shipments of the goods extremely necessary to the Soviet market now, especially under former commitments and agreements between the USSR and the GDR. He views his participation in economic support for perestroyka as "a contribution to solidarity within the framework of international responsibility."

V.M. Falin and the president's assistants E. Khuber and V. Sharnagl took part.

PRAVDA Carries Leaders' Dinner Speeches

Gorbachev's Remarks

PM1311124590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 1,5

[TASS report of speech given by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev in Bonn 10 November at an official dinner given in his honor by FRG Chancellor H. Kohl under the general heading: "In the Name of Common Interests"]

[Text]

M.S. Gorbachev's Speech

Esteemed Mr. Federal Chancellor!

Esteemed Mrs. Hannelore Kohl!

Ladies and Gentlemen! Comrades!

For myself and on behalf of Raisa Maksimovna and all my colleagues I express my thanks for what you have said here, for the cordiality, sincerity, and attention of which we have been acutely conscious during our stay in Bonn.

A great deal has changed in the world since my last visit. German unification being almost the most impressive event amid this turbulent flood of events.

This event is of multiple significance, including:

the reunification of a great nation;
joy for hundreds of thousands of families and relatives;
universally palpable changes in economic and political life and in the alignment of party forces;
the emergence in the center of Europe of a state with mighty economic, scientific and technical, and political potential;
totally different relations with all its neighbors; a new situation within NATO, the EEC, and other European communities and structures;
considerable innovation in the military and political aspects of the all-European process.

And, of course, there have been fundamental changes throughout the vast complex of Soviet-German relations, which is particularly important for us.

I could go on. But the range of quite extraordinary and major actions is tremendous.

One can only welcome the will, determination, and readiness of the German people, their government, and political parties to unite all forces within society and master this enormous national task within a short period.

And to resolve this task in harmony with its neighbors, even providing them with assistance, filed with a different kind of pride from before—pride in the fact that their Germany henceforth, and forever, is establishing itself as a strong, dynamic, and equal entity within the family of all European peoples.

The "wall" came down and the Brandenburg Gate opened exactly a year ago. There were of course objective reasons for German unification—both internal and external.

But the fact that it came about within a short period is due to the totally new political category in international affairs that emerged with perestroyka and the new thinking—**trust**.

We trusted in the durability of a democracy that had learned lessons from its country's Nazi past. You have trusted in the future of a democracy that resolutely and fiercely set about breaking up an administrative-edict system.

We have both sworn to be true to panhuman values. We have proved our devotion to freedom of choice and the principle of balance of interests in practice.

That is the main reason why the Soviet Union not only did not impede the accelerated process of German unification, but even assumed considerable responsibility in regulating its external aspects.

In this connection I would particularly single out the talks with Chancellor Kohl in Arkhyz.

Chroniclers will probably rank the Treaty on Good-Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation which we have signed today with the federal chancellor among the top international legal documents at the close of the bleak and tragic 20th century, ushering in a new peaceful period in history,

While making our own—incidentally, very great—contribution to putting an end to an entire era, we are beginning to painstakingly turn the pages of most recent history not only of our two countries but also Europe—from the Atlantic to the Urals.

In the past results would often be summed up, agreements signed, promises made, and hopes of better times expressed.... Yet soon everything would descend to the old routine and, at worst, the seeds of suspicion and enmity would appear once more.

Everything indicates that this will not happen to us this time. We are indeed turning toward a different kind of bilateral relations and—this is also of fundamental importance—in the context of European unity, in which the Soviet-German factor can play a unique, great role on a par with all others.

German unity has been given a firm foundation of goodwill and accord today. This happened with the approval and support of a large proportion of the world community and the United Nations.

There is much that is totally new and unusual now in the actual atmosphere of Soviet-German relations.

This newness goes deep. Germans and Russians, Germany and the Soviet Union are no longer potential military adversaries. They have no conceivable enemies in Europe at all.

This is, after all, a totally different situation, in which even the distant past appears quite different.

The gloomy events of this century have sometimes obscured in our memories the fact that in the long history of our relations there have been lengthy periods of beneficial economic, cultural, and human ties that brought our peoples together.

The interaction of two great cultures has not only served them but has also made a unique contribution to the all-European legacy, without which the creation of a unified cultural and historical space on the continent would be unthinkable today.

We must both now—before all Europe and the world—utilize sensibly and to the maximum everything enshrined in the treaty, fully reveal the positive groundwork inherent in our common past, and put everything that has been produced over the last few years to use.

I realize that we are responsible for a large proportion of the tasks, particularly those involved in creating conditions for economic cooperation which you find acceptable. A great deal is being done in the course of our reform to provide such conditions.

From you I would like to see boldness, latitude, forward thinking, and a healthy willingness to take risks. The main thing is that you are dealing with a great country that is not disadvantaged—either in terms of human and intellectual potential and culture, or in terms of its territory and natural wealth.

Certainly, profound transformations are under way in our country, but the renewed Union will remain a great power—with vast potential and secure prospects in the 21st century.

We have a high degree of understanding with many German partners on this, we share the same opinion as regards the scale of future cooperation between our two countries and, thus, as regards the momentum, wealth, and productivity of our relations.

Certainly, no one will resolve the problems of perestroyka for us. Everyone in our country has now realized this. However complex the tasks are, we will resolve them. But we will do so faster and better if we cooperate with other countries.

I do not think that it is such a difficult intellectual task to realize that this represents an investment in our common future, which will be more secure and predictable, more prosperous for us and for everyone.

I consider it necessary to voice a quite definite opinion on this issue.

There is still one sensitive side to our relations. Here I appeal to all Germans. Our soldiers will remain on your territory for some time. Legal questions have been resolved. We are grateful to Chancellor Kohl and to other FRG figures and departments who reacted with understanding to all the problems involved in the temporary stay and the return home of our Armed Forces.

The human aspect is now coming to the fore. Our military men here will have to grow accustomed to their new status.

Hans-Dietrich Genscher said this for both sides. Let us act to ensure that this is the case. If you like, this is a test of the ability to build relations between peoples on a truly humane and friendly basis.

I will say something else. The euphoria of discarding everything associated with the GDR regime—particularly over the last few years—has imparted painful nuances, which even bear an anti-Soviet tinge, to the attitude of some Germans toward the Soviet Union.

But I convinced that this is a temporary phenomenon. For 40 years, an addition to the official economic, military, state, public, and party ties between East Germany and our country, a massive answering flood of countless personal relationships developed between thousands and thousands of ordinary people at the same time.

The past was transformed and old grievances and prejudices melted away amid these direct, natural contacts, joint study and work, amid debates and thought; sincere affection was born and love and marriage occurred.

This is not to mention the ramified business ties, which form a valuable capital also capable of doing good service for our relations at the new stage.

It would not merely be a shame but also a dangerous mistake if this human proximity, which first paved the ways and byways to eliminate the enmity, mistrust, and hatred born of the dreadful war, were all to remain unused or rejected, or, worse still, overwhelmed by slander or a wrong verdict.

On this solemn day, when we have concluded a truly historic treaty between our great countries, I want to greet the millions of Germans in whichever German land they live, with whom we have long been friends—directly or indirectly—irrespective of their and our own political or ideological bias.

They have all made their contribution—albeit invisible and muted, nonetheless important and necessary—to what we are officially recording today.

On behalf of the Soviet people I greet the new united Germany. I wish the German people success in developing their unity, in resolving all their tasks on this responsible path, at the new stage of their development.

The Soviet Union will firmly advocate the comprehensive development of cooperation and friendship with the new Germany.

To the health of Federal Chancellor Mr. Helmut Kohl!

To the health of Mrs. Hannelore Kohl!

May there always be peace and prosperity on German soil in harmony and cooperation with neighbors and the entire world community!

Kohl's Dinner Speech

PM1311102190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report of a speech delivered by FRG Chancellor H. Kohl 10 November in Bonn at a dinner in honor of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, under the general heading: "In the Name of Common Interests"]

[Text] Bonn, 10 Nov—At an official dinner held yesterday on behalf of Federal Chancellor Kohl and his wife in honor of M.S. Gorbachev and R.M. Gorbacheva the two countries' leaders exchanged speeches.

H. Kohl's Speech

Esteemed Mr. President,
Esteemed Mrs. Gorbacheva,
Esteemed Soviet guests,
Ladies and Gentlemen!

It gives me great pleasure to wholeheartedly welcome you, your wife, and your delegation here.

I would at the same time like on behalf of all Germans to once again congratulate you on being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. We Germans, along with your compatriots and peoples throughout the world, are very pleased that you won this award.

You have transformed your country through your farsighted and bold reform policy.

You have introduced the new thinking to your country's foreign policy and security policy and considerably promoted the development of new East-West partnership relations. A new confidence has emerged.

This was a necessary condition for us to be able now to overcome the division of Europe once and for all, moreover in a spirit of peace, self-government, and human rights.

It is we Germans who can very gratefully appreciate your personal contribution to the happy turn in our history. It is exactly a year today that the Berlin wall fell. A few weeks ago our divided country and people restored their unity in conditions of freedom and in accord with all their neighbors and partners.

The fact that today you are the first foreign head of state to visit our united country further enhances our profound respect.

Through a quick succession of meetings we cleared the way for German unity together. The productive result of our meetings is unparalleled in the long history of our peoples.

—I remember your last visit to Bonn in June 1989. At that time we confirmed the principle of self-determination in our joint statement and laid the foundations for our personal trust.

—During my visit to Moscow this February we agreed that Germans themselves would decide the question of German unity, they themselves should choose the state form, the pace, and dates for bringing about this unity. At the same time our accord cleared the way for the constructive "two plus four" talks, for whose success we are profoundly grateful to all our partners.

—During our memorable meeting in the Caucasus we succeeded together in resolving highly difficult questions connected with German unification. There is no doubt now that Germany will help to strengthen security and stability throughout Europe. It is a member of the Atlantic alliance, which is itself changing.

The new relations of trust between our countries and new East-West policy as a whole have thus stood the crucial test of stability.

Today we are decisively turning toward the future. Remembering the particular responsibility which we bear as representatives of the same generation, we want to help put an end to the past, agonized chapter and develop cooperation between our countries and peoples amid conditions of lasting peace.

Guided by these considerations, we signed the Treaty on Good-Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation today. It will help strengthen mutual understanding between our countries. It will give a mighty new boost to reconciliation between our peoples. From today it is documented that German-Soviet relations have acquired a new, future-oriented quality which will exert its influence far into the next century.

The Treaty on the Development of Extensive Cooperation in the Sphere of the Economy, Industry, Science, and Technology was signed at the same time.

This treaty is of crucial significance in view of the profound economic and social reforms that you are implementing in order to develop a market economy.

Given the painful, but inevitable, transition period we are prepared to continue providing assistance with advice and action. We have frequently shown this over the last few months. We will bring our goodwill to this cooperation, along with our 40-year experience of developing a social market economy.

We will bring too our firm links with the EC and our important role at meetings of leading capitalist countries and also in international economic and financial institutions: We will also represent your country's interests there, as we have to date.

Mr. President!

The pledge which I made you in February still holds: "Our opportunity of unification will give the Soviet Union the opportunity of long-term cooperation with a politically stable and economically developed country in the center of Europe."

We have agreed and signed two other treaties, on the limited stay and systematic withdrawal of Soviet Armed Forces before the end of 1994, and on agreed measures covering the transitional period.

Allow me to confirm here that we will do everything we can to ensure that Soviet soldiers and their families feel fine during their remaining time here. They must retain pleasant memories of our country and return home to be guaranteed normal living conditions.

Soviet Germans also deserve our special attention [assignovaniya]. The treaty which we have signed today opens up new opportunities for them to preserve their language, culture, and traditions and develop their national, linguistic, and cultural originality. We will be glad to assist them in this.

We ask the Soviet authorities to make efforts in this direction in order to ease people's lives in their age-old homeland and will ask the Soviet leadership to give a sign encouraging them to hope that their future in the transformed USSR will be secure.

Mr. President! We realized from the very outset that in this day and age no country can guarantee its security, progress, and prosperity on its own. No country will be able in isolation to deal with the tremendous tasks that the future may hold. Bilateral cooperation is not enough here. All-embracing solutions firmly linking all of, Europe, along with the United States and Canada, were and are necessary for this.

That is why I am pleased that we will be meeting in Paris once again in a few days to confirm this by signing far-reaching documents at a meeting of the CSCE heads of state and government.

First, we will sign the first agreement on conventional Armed Forces in Europe. It confirms before all else the political transformations on our continent by securing the first significant reduction in the potential of both sides' conventional arms. We Germans have made an important contribution to the conclusion of this agreement in deciding the future numerical strength of our Armed Forces, and this example should be followed by other partners in subsequent talks.

Second, in a joint statement the NATO and Warsaw Pact states have noted that the time for confrontation is past and determined to lay the foundations for a new kind of cooperation between them. In a further statement the neutral and nonaligned states of Europe will be subscribing to this.

Third, through new confidence- and security-building measures we will consistently continue to proceed toward greater openness and to confidence-building in the military sphere. At the same time, we will underline our determination to bring both sides' military doctrines fully into line exclusively with the requirements of defense.

Fourth, and by no means last, we will be continuing to make progress along the successful CSCE road: on the basis of new institutions, along with progress toward a guaranteed rule-of-law state, political and social pluralism, and recognition of human rights and minority rights.

In this connection the human rights forum to be held in Moscow next year is of exceptional significance.

Fifth and last, a transatlantic statement to be adopted by the EC states in conjunction with the United States and Canada will underline their lasting political responsibility in and for Europe.

These five results of the Paris meeting confirm beyond doubt that:

—the time of confrontation on our continent is past once and for all, never to return;
—we will build the future together!
—during the last ten years of this century we Europeans have been given a unique historical chance to put our continent's primordial unity on a new footing. We are fully determined to utilize this opportunity.

It is we Germans, who have been at the epicenter of evil in this century, who are today faced with the task of setting an example of good;

—we must show effective solidarity with people in need;
—we need to assist in organizing self-help for the countries and peoples who are today laying the foundations for their economic and social revival.

As Germans and as Europeans we want to be equal to this task. We realize that we must think, plan and act with an eye to the long-range outlook.

Mr. President!

The firm ties uniting our peoples are like a living forest. The people sing songs and compose proverbs about them; they are a forest that has inspired great men of art, music, and literature.

We know that a forest does not grow overnight. It takes a generation or longer from seed to sapling and thence to mighty tree. But saplings must be planted today in order for our children and grandchildren to be able to bask in the shade of the tree.

That is precisely how we intend to act in relations between our countries and peoples, Mr. President.

Therefore I raise my glass

—to your well-being, Mr. President, and that of your wife!
—to a happy future for all your compatriots!
—to a new quality in our relations and to a new partnership between our countries and peoples!
—and also to our common work for the sake of peace and in defense of human rights in Europe and throughout the world!

Leaders Give Speeches Upon Gorbachev's Departure

Gorbachev Praises Visit

LD1011195790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Farewell speech by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev on 10 November in Oggersheim, Rhineland Palatinate; from the "Vremya" newscast—live or recorded]

[Text] Esteemed Herr Chancellor, Esteemed Frau Kohl, ladies and gentlemen: I make special mention of your local compatriots represented here by inhabitants of your town. On behalf of myself, of Raisa Maksimovna, and of all my colleagues, I wish to voice feelings of indebtedness for the hospitality, for the shared feelings, for the feelings of solidarity, and of concern for and understanding of our problems and the issues we have been tackling over these past few days, both in Bonn and here on your home ground. I interpret this as a manifestation of the new quality of relations between our peoples and countries.

You and I have spoken today of what we are doing meeting with approval among the peoples. This has been manifest today here in your native region, on the part of those who hail from your region and who comprise and form part of the German people. This means that it was not in vain that immense efforts and quests were undertaken—ending in certain conclusions and decisions, among which I would mention yesterday's Grand Treaty and the other agreements which went with it. This is very important. I agree that these two days—you said that yesterday was a great day, but I do not want to diminish the importance of today either—each of them is notable in its own way.

Of course, everything did not happen just in these two days. It is unlikely that we would have been able to resolve everything (?yesterday and today). Our peoples and their governments have traveled a long and difficult road to the present stage, to the present historic solutions. And this does our peoples honor, who from the difficult—perhaps the most difficult—period of our relations, throughout the entire history of these relations, have done the sole correct thing; as you said, while not forgetting the past—on the contrary—these sacrifices and all these losses suffered by the two peoples which fascism brought into conflict, they found in themselves both the moral strength and wisdom, met each other halfway, and traversed a difficult road. And we are reaping the fruits of this cooperation. Most important of all, we are opening a new page and perhaps even a new epoch in our relations.

We hope that this will turn out to yield new, outstanding fruits both for the Germans and for the peoples of the Soviet Union, for all Europeans, and for the entire world community. I am not afraid of using full expressions, because we are talking here after all about relations between two great peoples, between two states that play a huge role in world politics today, and I am sure that this role will not be diminished but will increase.

Also, if we are talking about peace and cooperation, about partnership, and are thinking about friendship, then this is what our world needs, our world filled to the brim with anxieties and problems. I am convinced that the work that has been done during these two days will be given due recognition, not only by our peoples but also by others.

I once again express sentiments of gratitude to your countrymen. I thank you, Frau Kohl, for inviting us to your home to chat and speak about many important things in a homely atmosphere. This is of great significance on a purely human level. I thank you and say farewell. [applause]

Kohl Promises To Push Reforms

LD1011210990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Report by correspondent V. Lyubovtsev from Rhineland Palatinate on FRG visit by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Raisa Gorbacheva, including recorded speech by Chancellor Kohl in Oggersheim on 10 November; from the "Vremya" newscast—Kohl speaks in German with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Lyubovtsev] Helmut Kohl is a native of Pfalz, an area of the federal state of the Rheinland Palatinate and, perhaps, the town of Speyer is the most interesting in the region from a historical point of view. Chancellor and Hannelore Kohl meet Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Raisa Maksimovna. Before a meeting with the household they are to see Speyer's sights—which, incidentally, is the partner town of Kursk. I say partner town because in previous years this was the formulation which was established to describe Soviet and West German towns which were developing close mutual links. With other countries we are not ashamed to say twin towns. I think it is time to cease making such exceptions. The epoch of confrontation is over, our president said yesterday in Bonn.

The chancellor talked about the happy turn in our joint history and destiny. On the streets the Soviet guests are surrounded by Pfalz inhabitants. Those born and bred in the Rhein area are well- known in the Federal Republic of Germany for their energy, love of life, and joie de vivre. One cannot fail to recall the same warm reception given to Gorbachev in June last year on German territory.

German unification affords the Soviet Union the opportunity for long-term interaction with a politically stable, and the most economically developed, state in the center of Europe. In this regard, today's press particularly highlights the chancellor's statement that the Federal Republic of Germany will help our perestroyka in word and deed, and that the Federal Republic of Germany will advocate effective support for the Soviet Union by the whole West European Community.

The Germans intend sending us a group of experts. They will assess the situation locally and will make sensible proposals. I think those in our country who assert that the application of experience of a market economy in the FRG in our conditions is almost the same as racing a Mercedes through a desert are not quite right. We can learn something from the acknowledged masters of their trade—disciplined and precise, whose labor enables the Federal Republic of Germany to maintain its position as world exporter number one.

It was difficult to get through the square of the unique Speyer imperial cathedral. It is so named because its construction began during the rule of Emperor Konrad II in the early 11th century. This ancient architectural monument on the Rhein is majestic—richly decorated stained-glass windows, arches, and portals. Unfortunately, photography was not allowed inside the cathedral. Imagine what would have happened there if the whole journalistic fraternity were allowed in there? But we have pictures we made before the arrival of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. You can form for yourself a certain impression of the interior decoration of the cathedral which, in contrast to many similar buildings, hardly suffered from bombing raids during the past war.

And this is a meeting in the small town of Deidesheim, on the way to Oggersheim, the home town of Helmut Kohl. Again the multitude of people, and again the words of greeting and good wishes. This summer Chancellor Kohl visited Stavropol Kray, the homeland of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The accords reached at this meeting were a decisive link in the process of the two-plus-four negotiations. The complex knot of contradictions which seemed unresolvable was disentangled. From that moment the question of the full sovereignty of Germany was in fact predetermined. It was during those days that the personal contacts of both countries' leaders became much warmer and more cordial.

And here Helmut Kohl is, as it were, making a reciprocal gesture. It is hard to remember when a foreign statesman visited the chancellor at Oggersheim. Journalists have been waiting patiently in front of the Kohl family house for the two countries' leaders to come out. And this is their last address to the press:

[Kohl] Yesterday was a great day. Both of us can say that we have worked very hard, together with others, and colleagues from the government and many other people, to achieve this occasion. Last summer, during a walk in the park of the chancellory, we spoke about the chances of concluding a great comprehensive treaty between Germany and the Soviet Union, which appeared to be still a long way off. Now we have achieved it. It has been a year of enormous changes. Many of these changes would not have been possible without your personal contribution and your support. This also applies to German unity, and I thank you for this especially warmly.

We have always agreed in our talks that it is necessary to overcome the problems of the present. One cannot understand the present if one does not know the past. And this is, between our peoples, a hard—and in important parts—a disastrous history. We do not want to forget this, but we want to learn our lesson from it. Therefore, we are trying not to repress our history, but to draw conclusions from it, to try and solve the problems of the present, and to enter into a common future, like good neighbors, with friendly relations between our peoples. Or, like a veteran of World War II put it to us in your home country: the two of you must ensure that our grandchildren will never have to experience what we have had to experience.

You are now facing great challenges. We hope your reformist policies will be successful. And we will help with this as much as we can. Because your success is also a success for peaceful development in Europe and in Germany.

General Moiseyev Hails FRG Visit Results

LD1111143990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1342 GMT 11 Nov 90

]By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 11 November (TASS)—"Because of its content and interim results," the two-day visit of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to the FRG "marks an important stage in the development not only of state-to-state relations but also of military relations between the two countries." This was stated by Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of staff of the Soviet Armed Forces. He was a member of the delegation which accompanied Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on his visit.

Interviewed by a TASS correspondent, General Moiseyev said that the results of his talks with Gerhard Stoltenberg, FRG minister of defense, and Admiral Dieter Wellershoff, the inspector-general of the Bundeswehr, show that the military leaders of the Soviet Armed Forces and the FRG Bundeswehr "do not wish to stand aside from the positive processes which are taking placing in the world and, especially, in Europe."

During the talks, the Soviet general noted, we discussed a number of problems connected with the stationing of Soviet troops on German territory, and the timetable and sequence for the withdrawal of these forces, and exchanged information. According to General Moiseyev, a number of specific measures for improving mutual contacts were outlined. He said they included visits to each other's military units and garrisons and the honoring of soldiers' graves.

Mikhail Moiseyev believes that the meetings and talks in the FRG fit naturally into the fabric of the broad political dialogue between Moscow and Bonn, which has gathered particular momentum in recent months. "In speaking of the development of relations between our countries, I would like to stress their new quality, the friendly quality," the general declared.

"The results of the talks with the German military leadership have enabled us to broaden the prospects for military ties on a long-term basis. They will help to develop bilateral relations and above all, strengthen security, stability and trust on the European continent," Army General Moiseyev said in conclusion.

Commentary Notes Gorbachev-Kohl 'Solidarity'

LD1011115190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1056 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Text] Before and after the signing of the treaty on good-neighborliness, partnership, and cooperation the president of the USSR and the federal chancellor held several meetings of great political significance. The trust of the two leaders for one another, their openness and a deep understanding of the interdependence of the problems of both societies have played an exceptional role in Soviet-German relations having reached their current boundary. Their conversations passed off in the same spirit this time as well, which has enabled the main aim of the visit, to a united Germany for the first time, to be realized—to impart a strong impetus to relations, which are unique in their own way, between two great peoples and states at a new stage in European and world development.

The chancellor enquired in detail about the situation in the Soviet Union, having stated that this interest of his was determined by a desire to know exactly how and when he should act to facilitate the success of perestroyka, with which the progress of the positive changes which were unfolding in Europe and the world were connected.

He received precise and frank replies and an analysis of the steps currently being taken in relation to the problems of economic transition and the transition of the Union's entire state structure into a new form. The chancellor received with understanding the information that the next 10 to 12 or 18 months would be the most difficult. During this time, support for the transition to the market would be particularly desirable—both from the point of view of equipping the population with necessary goods and from the point of view of adapting the economy to the laws of world economy.

The businesslike nature of the approaches of the president and the chancellor toward cooperation also affected the fact that the emphasis in their accords was placed on the necessity of achieving in the very future in both the Soviet Union and in Germany visible specific and practical results of Soviet-German interaction at the new stage.

Issues related to the supply of foodstuff resources during the coming winter and the medium-term period of the transition to the market, while maintaining supplies to the major industrial centers, were discussed. Also raised was the sale to the Soviet Union of surplus foodstuffs and industrial goods that have accumulated in the countries of the European Community.

The issue of the fate of property belonging to Soviet military organizations was discussed. Possibilities were considered for setting up joint enterprises for major projects, including those in which third countries participate, as well as the problems of conversion and of getting rid of the weapons belonging to the GDR Army.

Fitting attention was devoted to the problems of Soviet Germans.

M.S. Gorbachev and H. Kohl thoroughly discussed fundamental problems related to the contemporary European process, along with the role of the Soviet Union and Germany in that process. They established that there are large reserves for increasing their contribution to pan-European cooperation at the new stage. Both leaders are convinced that the interaction of two such states as the USSR and the FRG can and will play a major consolidating role in the formation of a peaceful period in history.

The current situation in the Persian Gulf was analyzed in detail. The president and the chancellor have complete mutual understanding regarding this issue—the UN resolutions must be carried out unconditionally. They expounded their appraisals at a joint news conference and in an interview to correspondents.

Amicability, mutual sympathy, a feeling of solidarity, and the scale of the approach toward each issue allowed this brief visit to be filled with much that was useful to both countries and allowed the prospects and opportunities for broad-based cooperation and friendly partnership between the two great peoples to be designated with confidence.

The talks were continued on 9 November at delegation level. Taking part in them on the Soviet side were E.A. Shevardnadze, S.I. Sitaryan, M.A. Moiseyev, A.S. Chernyayev, Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy, V.M. Falin, V.P. Terekhov; on the German side—H-D. Genscher, H. Haussmann, T. Waigel, N. Bluem, G. Stoltenberg, K. Blech, and other officials.

They reported on their discussions and talks. The USSR president and FRG chancellor made a general summary of the talks over the day.

Commentaries View, Assess Bilateral Treaty

Called CSCE Process Outgrowth

LD1111123390 Moscow TASS in English 1206 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By TASS political analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS—Analysing the Treaty of Good-Neighbourly Relations, Partnership and cooperation signed by the USSR and Germany in Bonn on November 9, political observers conclude that it is one of a new type of international legal act.

They appeared with the signing of the Soviet-Spanish political declaration and the treaty of concord and cooperation between the USSR and France.

These documents focus the development of the process initiated by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

They stress the need for bilateral and collective efforts to overcome Europe's division and to help establish a system of relations in tune with the aspirations of world nations and traditions of European civilisation.

Moreover, this focus on the future is the main component of the above documents.

This is quite logical, since European states have a common desire to achieve the continent's unity based on the strict observance of law and democracy.

Indicative in this context is a provision in the first article of the Soviet-German treaty, in which both sides stress that "they centre on man with his dignity and rights in their policies as well as care for mankind's survival and the preservation of the natural environment of his habitat".

The concept of building a future Europe, a home common for all Europeans, is based on these principles.

This concept concentrates on stronger peace, stability and security, the turning of Europe into a single region governed by law, democracy and cooperation in politics, economy, culture, information, etc.

This concept also presupposes the establishment, within the CSCE framework, of permanent consulting and coordination agencies and bodies. There should also be agencies to control the implementation of decisions and signed agreements.

It is planned that the forthcoming summit in Paris on November 19-21 will concentrate on these issues.

No serious discussion of long-term cooperation on the continent is possible without settling the key issue of Euroupean security.

The outlines of a new structure of collective security in Europe, which have developed, inspire hope, since they lay the foundations for mutual trust.

These are plans to set up a centre for prevention and solution of conflicts, the establishment of a pan-European parliamentary assembly and the formation of a mechanism for regular political meetings and consultations at various levels.

It is also planned to prioritise the following principles in relations between European states: respect for sovereignty, inviolability of national borders, non-use or threat of force.

There are now two processes which help to build European unity: on the one hand, bilateral treaties between all CSCE partners, and on the other, collective actions.

The two processes supplement and are unthinkable without each other. This is evidence of the growing interdependence of the world.

Treaty Opens 'New Chapter'

PM1111180190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Second Edition p 6

[Article by special correspondents Ye. Grigoryev and V. Drobkov: "It Is Up to Us..."]

[Text] Bonn, 10 Nov—Today is the final day of the USSR president's visit to the FRG. On this occasion M.S. Gorbachev's stay on German soil was short—less than a day and a half. Yet quite a lot has been achieved. Historians will have to gauge the true significance of the visit and of the documents that were signed. The passage of time itself will help to assess more accurately all that has taken place in the just over 30 hours that were filled to capacity with important meetings, talks, and official ceremonies.

But it is possible right now to claim confidently that a new chapter has been opened in the relations between our peoples and our states. Naturally, it has yet to be written out "in a fair copy," specific expression will have to be given to the accords, and the outlined plans will have to be translated into reality.

Nonetheless, the very signing of the Treaty of Good-Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation Between the USSR and the FRG in Bonn indicates how much headway Soviet-German relations have made and what profound changes have taken place in Europe. The "Grand" treaty, as many people are noting here, is geared to a grand future. It is capable of not just becoming the cornerstone of new relations between the Soviet Union and united Germany, but also of contributing to the well-being of the common European home.

When we asked USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze to comment on the Bonn talks, he noted in particular their fruitful character.

"They were rich in content and interest and were held in a good atmosphere," the minister said. "They were distinguished by a businesslike and constructive approach. Specific new areas were outlined for the development of our cooperation and the implementation of the new 'grand' treaty. Substantial results have been achieved in the economic sphere—major new joint projects were discussed. Social issues were widely touched upon. In general it is possible to say that solid new building blocks were prepared for the common home which is being erected in Europe...."

The "yield" from this first meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and united Germany looks substantial. The Treaty of Good-Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation provides the necessary political and legal foundation for new relations between our countries. The Treaty on the Development of Large-Scale Cooperation in the Economic, Industrial, Scientific, and Technological Spheres will, we hope, be of vital importance for us during the complex period of the transition to a market economy. In addition to identifying specific areas of business collaboration and a number of development projects, it enshrines important FRG Government commitments for the transitional period with a view to preserving and developing ties which have taken shape over the past decades in production-sharing and science and technology between the USSR and what used to be the GDR and has now become new federal laender of Germany.

We must also mention the agreement on our countries' cooperation in the social and labor sphere which was concluded yesterday. We were told by N. Bluem, federal minister for labor and social affairs, who signed this document on the German side, that it makes provision for broad cooperation throughout the sphere of social policy. It is a question of exchanges of experts, assistance in the establishment of a Soviet job-placement system, consultations and skill enhancement in the sphere of labor protection, and so forth. The social sphere is of fundamental importance for people's lives and therefore this is not some kind of "secondary" agreement, it has a most direct bearing on the building and improvement of our new relations, the minister said.

Having observed the events of the past few days, we must note that despite the banner headlines in the press aptly stressing the historic importance of the visit and its results, the talks and meetings in Bonn had the minimum of protocol unavoidable in international contacts. They were devoted above all to intensive political work.

Today from early morning onward the president held meetings with Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher, and Finance Minister T. Waigel, who is also chairman of the Christian Social Union party. An exchange of opinions was also held with the leader of the Social Democratic Party, which is one of the key features in the German political landscape. Talks with the chancellor were also continued.

A thorough discussion took place, for instance, not just on bilateral or European affairs, but also on such a hot problem as the situation in the Persian Gulf. The dangerous situation in this region is of direct concern to the Germans. And it is not just a matter of oil. Although the mission of W. Brandt, honorary chairman of the SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany] and leader of the Socialist International, to Baghdad ended with the freeing of a number of hostages, quite a few German citizens are still being detained there. Furthermore the plan to send two divisions of the U.S. forces currently deployed in the FRG to Saudi Arabia is another matter which "brings home" the Gulf to the Germans. Judging from appearances, the Soviet president's remarks on approaches to a peaceful settlement of the crisis have met with understanding here both in official circles and among the public.

But, to return to bilateral relations, maximum use was made of the time available during the visit to discuss further specific work proceeding from the concluded treaties. And here it is appropriate to mention not only the president's work but also the meetings of the ministers and other officials accompanying him with their German counterparts. It still seems strange to see General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of our General Staff, in the offices of the Federal Ministry of Defense. But the establishment of cooperation in the military sphere assumes particular importance now in the new conditions of united Germany, if for no other reason than that our forces will remain in the east of the country for a number of years to come. And they need a normal and friendly "environment." There were in-depth businesslike talks between the leaders responsible for foreign economic affairs—S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and H. Haussmann, minister of the economy.

"The times of high-flown speeches are over," the newspaper GENERAL-ANZEIGER writes in its editorial today. "Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Bonn and the signing of the package of treaties mark the completion of the political regulation of the fundamental changes in relations between the two countries in connection with the unification of Germany and provide a firm basis for building the future. Henceforth it will be sober day-to-day work to implement this great task."

And indeed, the president has done everything necessary for our people to acquire guaranteed peace, good-neighborliness, and the conditions necessary for mutual useful partnership with united Germany. But all this is yet to be translated into concrete actions. We make no secret of the fact that in this context many alarming questions are being raised both in personal conversations and in the press at large. They stem from the familiar difficulties of the crucial stage of Soviet perestroyka. People here wish it success and are prepared to help both with advice and materially. And it is not so much a matter of gratitude for the Soviet stance in the process of the German unification as of awareness of the interdependence of fates in present-day Europe. One local observer writes: German assistance in the reconstruction of the Soviet economy "is in keeping with the most fundamental German interests since, if this fails, the social and political chaos in the East is bound to have an impact also on the center of Europe."

However, the fate of perestroyka, people here are repeating literally in unison, depends above all on the Soviet people themselves. "Neither humanitarian aid, nor credits, nor joint projects can ensure success. Without the efforts on the part of the states which are implementing the reforms themselves, everything else is futile," we read in a commentary by observer W. Bell. "Good will alone is not enough," writes SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITING, developing the same theme. "Of course it is possible to supply food as a matter of urgency to help the country survive the winter. But this will not boost its economy. To achieve this what is needed above all are the country's own efforts, striving, industry, and a willingness to work. These are the foundations of a better future. If they are laid, investments will follow."

There is no denying that it would do no harm to listen to the benevolent thoughts which are being expressed in a country whose whole prosperity is based on precisely this industry and willingness to work.

German Coverage of Gorbachev's FRG Visit

WA1311154990

For reportage on the visit by Gorbachev to Germany, including reports on his talks with President Richard von Weizsaecker and Chancellor Helmut Kohl, including his speech given at an official dinner and the "text" of the treaty between the FRG and the USSR on developing comprehensive cooperation on the economy, industry, science and technology, please see the Germany section of the 13 November West Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Commentaries Preview Gorbachev FRG Visit

Germans Welcome Visit

LD0911161390 Moscow TASS in English 1546 GMT 9 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Kalintsev, Aleksandr Samozhnev and Aleksandr Semenov]

[Text] Bonn November 9 TASS—Germany's politicians and mass media focus on President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to their country.

German Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher has called for a more consistent support by Western countries for the Soviet president's reform policy.

The success of Gorbachev's policy, he said in an interview with the RTL private television programme, is of importance for the political situation not only in Europe but in the whole world.

This is why the Federal Government is so persistent in prompting its western partners not to miss this historic chance. Under Gorbachev's leadeship, Genscher noted, the Soviet Union is advancing in the right direction towards greater democracy and a market economy.

Support for wider cooperation in all fields between the united Germany and the Soviet Union was voiced today by Wolfgang Boetsch, chairman of the CSU [Christian

Social Union] Bundestag faction. The Soviet president, he said, faces economic difficulties. This is why it is necessary to do what can be done to help Gorbachev accomplish reforms.

Gorbachev's visit to Germany, Boetsch stressed, can be figuratively represented as the transfer of the key to German unity. Bonn is now called upon to play the part of a specific bridge helping integrate the Soviet Union into the common European home.

It is deeply symbolic that President Gorbachev arrives in Germany on the first anniversary of the day when the Berlin Wall crumbled, the NEUE OSNABRUECKER ZEITUNG points out.

The peace policy pursued by the Soviet leader created preconditions for a peaceful revolution in the former German Democratic Republic. This is why Germans are deeply grateful to Gorbachev.

During his visit, landmarks for long-term cooperation will be established, which in no way contradicts the interests of Germany's western allies.

The Berlin Wall crumbled on November 9 last year. A year later, a treaty will be signed that will make a bridge into the future in relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. Undoubtedly, this bridge has a firm foundation.

Gorbachev urgently needs outside assistance to cushion the negative effects of the economic crisis. Bonn views this with understanding. However, soviet people must solve the main problems themselves. These include the transition to a market economy, democratisation and the creation of a state ruled by law. It remains to hope that Gorbachev's foreign political successes will be followed by changes for the better inside the Soviet Union.

President Gorbachev's visit marks the climax in the development of relations between the Soviet Union and Germany, a business community newspaper, DAS HANDELSBLATT, points out.

The federal government favours the prompt adoption by leading industrial powers of a plan of assistance to the Soviet Union. As regards bilateral relations, they should be consistently filled with specific substance.

It is also important to organise training and retraining of Soviet economic specialists and broad-scale youth exchange between the two countries, the newspaper stresses.

'Close Link' Guaranteed

LD0911072490 Moscow TASS in English 0710 GMT 9 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Samozhnev]

[Text] Bonn November 9 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev arrives here today for his first visit to a reunited Germany at the invitation of Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl.

A treaty on goodneighbourliness, partnership, and cooperation between the two countries is to be signed within the framework of the two-day visit.

Gorbachev's visit and the signing of the Soviet-German document provide big chances for large-scale future-oriented cooperation between the reunited Germany and the Soviet Union, Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher told the EXPRESS newspaper.

"This treaty is not only a bilateral achievement. It guarantees the Soviet Union a close link with the destiny of Europe," he said.

"We welcome President Gorbachev, a man to whom we Germans are greatly indebted. Through his reform policies, he has opened up the way for democratic revolutions in East European countries and for German reunification," Genscher said.

From the political and economic points of view, the West is interested in the success of the reforms in the Soviet Union and East European countries. Those who view Europe as a single whole and who favour the final overcoming of the division of the continent should welcome the Soviet Union's and those countries' striving for close cooperation with the West, Genscher pointed out.

Economic and ecological renewal is one of major future international tasks. It is possible to resolve these tasks only through joint efforts, Genscher added.

Touching upon the stay of Soviet troops on the territory of former East Germany, Genscher said that Soviet soldiers are in need of humane sympathy and support. This is an important task of Soviet-German understanding. "I am calling on the population of the newly formed Lander to contribute to securing that Soviet citizens leave our country with good recollections," Genscher emphasised.

Joint Treaty Previewed

PM0911114790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[Report by special correspondents Ye. Grigoryev and V. Drobkov under the rubric: "Foreign News": "View from Petersberg Hill: The FRG on the Eve of M.S. Gorbachev's Visit"]

[Text] Bonn—From Petersberg, one of the peaks of the Siebengebirge hills along the Rhine, there is a magnificent panorama. On the left there is the jagged outline of a medieval castle. According to legend it was there, at Drachenfels, that Siegfried, hero of the German epic, slew the hideous monster. Down below you see the mighty mass of water of the river which the people respectfully call "old father Rhine."

On Petersberg there is an official residence for guests of the FRG Government. M.S. Gorbachev will arrive here from the airport. The main purpose of the Soviet President's second visit to the Rhine is to sign the Treaty on Good-Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation between the USSR and the FRG. This document was prepared and initialed two months ago. So the signing ceremony itself will not take long.

Nevertheless, the eminent guest will not have time to admire the beauty of the Rhenish landscape. The schedule of the visit is packed. There are to be conversations and meetings with Federal President R. von Weizsaecker and Federal Chancellor H. Kohl and wide-ranging talks involving ministers and other representatives of the two sides. And the journalists accredited for the visit can expect a joint press conference between M.S. Gorbachev and H. Kohl after the signing of the treaty.

The bulk of the second and last day of the visit will be spent in the Rhineland-Palatinate. Chancellor Kohl, "responding" to his visit to Stavropol and the Caucasus, which greatly impressed him, will acquaint his guest with sights in his native land. There will be a visit to the ancient town of Speyer, which is now celebrating its 2,000th anniversary, the picturesque town of Deidesheim, one of the viticultural and wine-producing centers of the Palatinate, and Kohl's own home in the Ludwigshafen suburb of Oggersheim. The conversations there will mark the end of the day's political program which will resume at Petersberg with meetings with Foreign Minister Genscher and afterward with Social Democratic leaders.

"We attach great significance to President Gorbachev's visit," people in the Federal Chancellor's immediate circle are saying. "The chancellor and the president have already agreed that they will sign the Treaty on Good Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation themselves. In our view, this is an extremely important document. It places relations between the USSR and the FRG after German unification on a completely new basis. We want to symbolize by this document that we intend to develop relations with the Soviet Union which are as all-embracing and typical of partners as possible. In all spheres—from the economy and culture to ecology and youth exchange. This is our serious intention enshrined in the treaty."

"Another thing in which we are greatly interested," we heard in an office of the Federal Chancellor's department, "is that President Gorbachev's course should be maintained and crowned with success. The Federal Chancellor has noted a number of times that this is of fundamental significance not only for the Soviet Union but also for all of Europe, the whole world, and East-West relations in general. In this connection he favors giving real economic, technological, and other support to the course of reforms in the USSR. I think that the EC countries and the United States will soon be convinced of the need for such support."

Good wishes are being expressed for the visit and the new relations between our countries wherever you go here. Politicians and commentators are stating as much. The general state of and prospects for our relations are undoubtedly positive factors. At the same time, in practical cooperation, as in life, nothing is completely perfect. Take, for example, the trade and economic sphere. Unfortunately, the difficult processes of unifying the economies of the western and eastern parts of Germany and the introduction of the West German mark as the single means of payment are proving quite negative for Soviet interests. Cooperation bottlenecks will have to be resolved.

And, of course, even with the best relations and excellent contractual bases, the implementation of plans always needs attention and hard work.

This also applies fully to the sphere of cooperation in European and world politics. It is presumed here that the sides will exchange opinions on the Persian Gulf situation. The FRG is also seriously concerned about it. Hundreds of German hostages are being held in Iraq and W. Brandt, honorary chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD], is now in Baghdad trying to secure the release of at least some of them. It may be presumed that a significant part of the USSR president's visit will be taken up with European problems, the prospects for the forthcoming meeting of European heads of states and governments in Paris, and questions of disarmament and the creation of common European security structures.

So on Friday our state flags will fly from the flagstaffs in Bonn. But we would like to emphasize once more the attitude being shown toward our president and our country by many FRG citizens who wish perestroyka success and express a desire for the strengthening of trust and cooperation between the peoples of the USSR and Germany.

"It is our firm intention to cooperate with the Soviet Union, particularly in the economic sphere. And in the sphere of culture and other areas where there are joint interests," O. Lafontaine, prime minister of the Saarland, deputy chairman of the SPD, and the party's candidate for the chancellorship, stated in a short interview for PRAVDA. "Therefore we will support the new USSR-FRG treaty and make our contribution to the development of German-Soviet friendship. The treaty will serve the rapprochement between Germans and the Soviet peoples. After all, this document is not only political but also economic. It envisages cooperation between people, and that is the most important thing for me, because world peace becomes more durable as rapprochement between people grows."

Treaty's Importance Highlighted

LD0911125790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1025 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Excerpts] Now an urgent news bulletin. The visit by USSR President Gorbachev to the Federal Republic of Germany starts today. [passage omitted] On the line at the moment are our special correspondents in Bonn, Viktor Levin and Vyacheslav Mostovoy. Can you hear me, Viktor Nikolayevich?

[Levin] I can hear you, but there is just one correction: it is our colleague Aleksandr Pozharskiy who is working with me. But let us get down to business. A few minutes ago, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev arrived at Cologne-Bonn airport, and the welcoming ceremony is now taking place. The visitors are being welcomed by Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher. So, the visit has begun.

It is intended to be a new point of departure, an indicator of the way in the near future and in the long term. The material expression of this will be the treaty of good-neighborliness, partnership and cooperation, which will be signed today. The treaty is important from at least two points of view. First, it crowns the package of accords on the whole complex of the German settlement and forms a balance of interests. I shall dwell on that in somewhat greater detail. If one considers each of the recently concluded Soviet-German agreements, one may get the wrong impression. I have heard people ask, for example, why did the Soviet Union opt so easily for granting Germany complete sovereignty? Why did we not exact an appropriate political payment for that? Well, first, sovereignty is the sacred right of each people, and not a favor that one may, or may not, bestow. People will say: that is theory, but that is not the way everything is in practice. Incidentally, the Germans do appreciate the Soviet Union's position, realizing that we might well have dug our heels in, but would that have been a farsighted policy? Of course not. The Germans would have acquired sovereignty anyway. What happened, including unification, could not fail to happen. Our assistance has been given a high appraisal now and will, I am sure, have a very positive influence in the future, too. That is one aspect of the problem.

The other is the fact that the natural, inevitable, apprehensions and worries that the Soviet Union, and not just the Soviet Union, has when thinking back to the tragic past, are being taken into account by the German side. [passage omitted] The Germans remember the dark pages in their history and are bringing up the younger generation in a corresponding spirit. The concept of reconciliation is a reflection of a whole policy designed, not by forgetting, but by remembering, the past, to create the foundations for good-neighborliness and partnership. Unification, said FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, increases the measure of responsibility rather than of power. And Germany's responsibility is clearly recorded in the treaty of good-neighborliness, partnership, and cooperation. It can even be said that the treaty gives us substantial guarantees of our security, moreover, not just military security, but also social, economic, and ecological security. A treaty on the development of large-scale cooperation in the economy, industry, science and technology fields will also be signed, but more on that later. [passage omitted]

Political & Social

Gorbachev, Yeltsin May Lead New 'Coalition'

LD1211153890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1305 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] [Announcer Irina Chirkova] It is 1605 in Moscow and the 'Mayak' Panorama is handing the microphone to our political observer, Yuriy Semenov, who will comment on the news.

[Semenov] Well, to be more accurate, I shall be reflecting on an item in the news. Our listeners—or most of them—probably already know that yesterday a meeting took place in the Kremlin between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the country's president, and Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, the chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet. The reports on this meeting have been very terse up to now. But one should understand that this was a working meeting between two of our leaders. There is no need for lengthy communiques on such occasions. Nevertheless, even the short report that we got and the few details that emerged about this meeting provide food for a certain amount of thought and evaluation.

We know that Gorbachev and Yeltsin held private talks between 1500 and 1700 yesterday. Later they were joined by Comrades Ryzhkov, Silayev, and Khasbulatov. I think there is reason to say that the two men first discussed certain fundamental approaches, certain very important approaches. Then, after they were joined by the others, they discussed ways of implementing these approaches. The atmosphere at the talks was described as businesslike and, at the same time, principled. When they discussed the preparation of a new Union treaty and the country's switch to a market economy, particular attention was paid, by all accounts, to the implementation of anti-crisis measures, especially ones to provide the population with food and goods.

I would like to draw the listeners' attention to the following fundamental points that lend significance to this meeting. First, this was the resumption of a dialogue, following the fairly heated and public polemics between the two leaders that took place on 16 and 19 October, in the speeches which were made then. Again I think it is very important that they have been able to overcome the personal differences separating them and resume this dialogue.

The second point I would like to note is that relations between the center and Russia will, to a great extent, decide the future of the Union. A new Union treaty is being drafted and prepared. But it is a fact that the republics want their relations with the center to be a reality now without waiting for them to be formalized in the new Union treaty. Naturally all the republics and, of course, all national state entities within Russia itself, are watching the development of the relationship between the Center and Russia.

The third point: Difficult as it may be, it is essential to reconcile in some way the Basic Guidelines for Economic Stabilization and Transition to the Market adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the 500 days plan adopted in Russia. As you know, there are differences between them and these must be overcome, in some way or other, so that the two programs are at least compatible.

The fourth point: I have already mentioned that it is, of course, extremely important to adopt urgent measures to satisfy consumer demand and to prevent a social explosion—and I do not apologize for using that word, the people's patience with empty shelves in the shops and the constant hunt for scarce goods has already run out.

Finally, there is a political point that I would like to make, the fact that yesterday's meeting makes one somewhat hopeful, provisionally hopeful, that a center-left coalition can be formed in due course. In my view this is the only way to unite the country or, at least, all supporters of its progressive development.

[Chirkova] What kind of center-left coalition do you have in mind?

[Semenov] The experience of many countries shows that real politics are as a rule centrist politics, which draw ideas both from the left and, to a certain extent, from the right. In our country, too, a struggle is under way—to a certain extent—between right-wingers and left-wingers, who want to exert influence on the center. At the same time, I think, support for the center from both the right and left has declined of late. This is because of the gap between declarations and the real situation in the country. Therefore, it seems to me, the unification of left-wing forces with progressive and reform-minded elements of the centre offers hope of tranquillity and progress in the country, without conflicts, convulsions, and spasms.

[Chirkova] Well, I cannot agree with that.

[Semenov] Well, no doubt that's also a sign of the times, the fact that you and I can hold different views on one and the same question.

[Chirkova] I think the fact that we are now openly admitting the differences which exist today and which move life along is more symbolic of the times. On this point we should probably conclude our discussion.

[Semenov] I would like to end by noting that, talking to correspondents the previous day, at the Kremlin Cup tennis tournament, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin said there would be a whole series of meetings with President Gorbachev. I think we are all interested in this and we will be closely following the continuation of this dialogue.

'Doomed' To Cooperate

LD1211171790 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS World Service observer Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow November 12 TASS—The talks between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Russian President Boris Yeltsin on Sunday [11 Nov], their second in three months, hit the headlines in the Soviet Union.

This was their first meeting after weeks of disagreement.

The two leaders seem to be "doomed" to cooperation, irrespective of their personal likes and dislikes and their political rivalry.

In early August, Gorbachev, who personifies centrist forces, and Yeltsin, who leads the radicals, agreed to coordinate measures to implement economic reforms in the country.

However, their alliance proved short-lived, which largely told on the reforms and the situation in the country. Negative tendencies in the economy and centrifugal tendencies in constituent republics strengthened. The country approached the brink of an abyss.

Yeltsin found out that radical reforms were impracticable in Russia without Gorbachev's support, as was Gorbachev's radical transformation of Soviet society without Russia.

The meeting on Sunday offered the two leaders one of the last chances to stabilise the situation in the country.

An official report on the meeting said Gorbachev and Yeltsin discussed a new union treaty. Russia's position on this treaty will largely determine its fate, as well as the fate of the whole union.

A clear-cut distribution of powers between the centre and republics, above all Russia, would be the first step to eliminating the vacuum of power at various levels.

It would help remove the dangerous uncertainty in relations with other countries and give a fresh impetus to economic reforms.

Hopes for Solidarity Expressed

PM1211150590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by R. Aleksandrov: "Meeting Between M. Gorbachev and B. Yeltsin"]

[Text] It has already been reported that a meeting between President M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, was held on 11 November, and was attended by N.I. Ryzhkov and I.S. Silayev, heads of the USSR and Russian Governments respectively, and by R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Parliament.

IZVESTIYA's correspondent was told at the USSR President's Press Service that in the course of the conversation, which lasted about two hours, M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yelstin had a one-on-one discussion on a range of questions associated with the implementation of economic reform in the country and the conclusion of the Union treaty and its subsequent enactment [vvedeniye v rabochiy rezhim],

Afterwards, in the following three hours, these and other urgent questions were examined in detail, with participation by the other USSR and RSFSR leaders.

The meeting was exhaustive [nasyshchennaya] and proceeded in a constructive atmosphere, which is especially important today, because this gives ground for hope for all of our society's healthy forces.

Red Square Gunman Arrest Details Reported

PM1311151390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Report by N. Krivomazov: "With a Shotgun Instead of a Flag; Once More About Red Square Shootings"]

[Text] "Well, what did you do after the incident on Red Square?" I asked one of the precinct inspectors who on 7 November were standing in plain clothes in the corridor between the columns of demonstrators.

There was 28-year-old Senior Sergeant Andrey Mylnikov, 22-year-old precinct inspector Sergey Kagamlitskiy, 30-year-old precinct officer Nikolay Morozov, and Militia Captain Sergey Ovchinnikov. This time the main "precinct" for their work was Red Square. The date of the operation was 7 November.

Twice a year Ovchinnikov stands guard in Red Square. There is no extra pay for this honorable watch, no day off is offered in lieu—that is the custom. On the other hand it is not customary to be on duty in militia uniform. So each man dresses as he please. This fall, for instance, Sergey did not find any "civilian" shoes in the stores, he had to put on his old ones with the split soles. So he would have been better off in uniform.

As usual the militiamen were placed in the so-called corridor separating the columns of demonstrators. The Babushkinskiy Rayon sector officers were placed in the penultimate, eighth file. Almost next to the State Department Store. One was looking at the Mausoleum, another at the store, side by side. The militiamen's task is to study anyone who stops in an unauthorized place.

...He was tall, wearing a hooded jacket. Scarcely had the stranger come to a standstill and started to undo his jacket before Sergey instinctively gave a shove with his shoulder to his neighboring "number" and took a step forward. A two-barreled shotgun appeared from inside the jacket. The first to notice the trouble was Senior Sergeant Andrey Mylnikov. A shot! Precinct inspector Morozov from the 138th division rushed forward from the other side and with him was precinct officer Kagamlitskiy. A second shot rang out.

"I grabbed him," Ovchinnikov says, "and my comrades seized the gun. We took the gunman to a recess in the State Department Store."

"Who took him?"

"Well, our boys, from approximately number 35 to number 41. The devil knows what he was planning. A bomb? An explosives package [vzryvpaket]? A submachine gun?"

"What can you say about the arrested man, Shmonov?"

"Sallow, unshaven, nervous."

"What did you and your colleagues do after the arrest?"

"We went to have a long sleep. And then reports appeared in the newspaper that the arrest had been made by workers of the law enforcement bodies. For some reason everyone decided it had been made by the chekists. But it was us, at the lowest possible rank. None of them can understand why someone had come to the celebration with a gun instead of a flag..."

We were told yesterday at the USSR KGB investigation administration that criminal proceedings have been instituted against Aleksandr Anatolyevich Shmonov under part two article 15 and part one article 66 of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] criminal code (attempting an act of terrorism). It has been officially confirmed that 38-year-old Shmonov, who did indeed work as a fitter at the "Izhorskiy zavod" production association, had left three weeks before the holiday. He will soon be sent for in-patient medical assessment. There will also be an investigation into whether this man acted alone or had accomplices.

Staging of Shooting Denied

PM1211115190 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 13 Nov 90 First Edition p 4

[USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Press Center-TASS report: "Laying the Blame on Someone Else? Details of Incident in Red Square"]

[Text] An 11 November Radio France International program contained a commentary on the incident that occurred in Red Square in Moscow during the holiday demonstration.

It turned out, the French radio reported, that Shmonov is "a member of the Western branch of the Free Democratic Party of Russia and a member of the Leningrad People's Front." This incident "has become the subject of a session of the front's coordination council and the party board. The participants in the session noted two strange details: According to the testimony of people who know Shmonov well, he was distinguished by his mild and obliging nature and they also noted that according to an official report the incident had been filmed. In general this is all like a theatrical performance. In the opinion of some of those taking part in the session the likelihood is not ruled out that the incident's staging was well rehearsed by the competent organs."

The most "competent organ" in this entire story is Senior Militia Sergeant A. Mylnikov, division chief of the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee Internal Affairs Main Administration patrol checkpoint service first regiment, who apprehended the lawbreaker:

"On 7 November I was on duty in Red Square, some 150-200 meters from the Mausoleum. At 1110-1115, when the column of working people from the capital's Baumanskiy Rayon had entered the square, my attention was attracted among the flow of demonstrators by a citizen who, it seemed to me, was behaving rather strangely—he was constantly looking around, tightly grasping something concealed beneath his clothing. Suddenly the stranger brought out from inside his coat a sawed-off two-barrel shotgun.

"My reaction was instant. With a leap I managed to grab him by the arm and to direct the barrels upward. A shot resounded. Then I once again succeeded in turning the weapon away from people and the second shot fortunately hit no one. I tore the shotgun from the lawbreaker's hands and at that moment KGB workers and cadets from the Moscow militia higher school came to my assistance."

The events described by A. Mylnikov are well known, they have been reported in the press and on Central Television and all-Union radio. And it would be possible not to return to them were it not for the attempts of lawbreaker A.A. Shmonov's like-minded party associates to lay all the blame at someone else's door, as the saying goes.

The hint of some kind of deliberate "staging" citing the fact that the incident was filmed is naive and "sly." It was recorded not by Central Television cameramen but by a group of cameramen from the TASS audiovisual editorial office.

Newspaper Profiles Gunman

LD1011120290 Moscow TASS in English 1049 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 10 TASS—The SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper today publishes a profile of Aleksandr Shmonov, who was arrested on Wednesday on Moscow's Red Square after he fired two shots from a sawed-off shotgun during a Revolution Day demonstration.

A dispatch from Leningrad says that Shmonov earlier worked at the Izhorskiy Zavod plant.

During the elections to the Soviet parliament in the spring of 1989, he was member of an electors' association of the 52nd electoral district, which was closely connected with the Leningrad People's Front.

The newspaper says that practically all rallies organised by the association in the suburbs of Leningrad, Kolpino, Pavlovsk and Pushkin were marked by scandals.

Shmonov could be seen at the plant's doors selling booklets and newspapers of the Democratic Union, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA says.

It adds that Shmonov and a son of Kolpino's police chief duplicated anti-communist leaflets.

After Shmonov quit his job at the plant, he could be seen near Leningrad's Gostiny Dvor department store selling leaflets and newspapers of the Democratic Union and other "democratic publications" the newspaper says.

KGB Denies Allegations of Other Attacks

LD1111170390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] We have just received a report from the public relations center of the USSR KGB. It says that on 10 November the Lithuanian newspaper RESPUBLIKA published a report on three attempts to carry out terrorist acts alleged to have taken place during the festive parade on Red Square. The USSR KGB states officially that, apart from the shots fired by Shmonov, against whom criminal charges have been brought, there were no other terrorist acts on 7 November on Red Square, and the publication in the newspaper RESPUBLIKA is a fabrication.

Bakatin Reports on 7 Nov GOSR Demonstrations

LD1011164790 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Text] The Soviet interior minister, Vadim Bakatin, has reported that demonstrations on 7 November in support of the Russian Socialist Revolution took place in 157 major cities. In 30 cities people joined alternative marches and rallies to express their hard feelings about the revolution. They involved only 85,000 people, compared to several million who marched in support of the revolution. In all cases, said Bakatin, the demonstrators were protected by police.

CPSU Secretariat Debates Union Integrity

PM1211121590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[PRAVDA-TASS report: "For Integrity of Renewed Union"]

[Text] The latest session of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat held under the chairmanship of V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, examined a number of questions concerning the party's position on the matter of preserving the integrity of the renewed Union, forming a civil society, and strengthening the rule-of-law state.

Perhaps there is no more acute or topical subject today than the problem of the future of the Union. Public passions are seething over the new Union treaty, whose speediest conclusion has been advocated by the supreme organs of power of a number of union republics and national-territorial formations. For all the diversity of viewpoints the majority of people see in the Union treaty the only possible way of preventing the further escalation of tension in interethnic relations and of creating the necessary conditions for intensifying democratic transformations.

The CPSU takes the most active part in this work. The program statement of the 28th party congress "toward a humane, democratic socialism" cites among the priority tasks that of elaborating a new treaty on the Union of the republics as sovereign states based on a strictly voluntary principle, mutual advantage, and freedom of national self-determination.

Delay here could lead to the most serious consequences: the intensification of centrifugal tendencies, the growth of interethnic conflicts, and the disintegration of the economy and social life. The real danger of such a turn of events and the vitally important need to form an all-union market as the economic basis for a qualitatively new Union was stated most specifically at the CPSU Central Committee October (1990) Plenum.

At this extraordinarily complex and crucial moment it is essential that all citizens of the country realize that the perestroyka of the Union on a renewed treaty basis is a paramount vital question.

Speaking at the session, CPSU Central Committee Secretaries O.D. Baklanov, A.N. Girenko, V.V. Gidaspov, A.S. Dzasokhov, V.A. Kuptsov, V.M. Falin, O.S. Shenin, and G.I. Yanayev; CPSU Central Committee Secretariat members V.A. Gayvoronskiy and I.I. Melnikov; Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow party gorkom [city committee]; and V.A. Mikhaylov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Nationalities Policy Department, spoke of the need to tell people the undistorted, complete truth about the principles which will be put at the basis of the renewal of the Soviet multinational state, about the real supplementation of the republics' sovereignty and the clear demarcation of the functions of union and republican organs, and about the necessary political and legal prerequisites, contained in the new document, for the implementation by all peoples of their right to self-determination and self-management.

The party committees and primary party organizations should activate their work in this direction. They must show in a convincing and reasoned way where nationalist slogans and calls for separatism lead. Isolationism and counting only on one's own forces inevitably cause the collapse of the unified national economic complex, the disorganization of the economy, the undermining of the foundations of the all-union market, the growth of economic chaos, and the decline of the population's living standard. People must clearly realize that the weakening of the role of the Union in the world community and its division into several states will undermine the stability of international relations and jeopardize the positive changes which have emerged in the world thanks to the new political thinking.

It has been recommended to the party committees that they broadly enlist delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress, Communist deputies of all levels, figures of culture, scientists, and the party aktiv to explanatory work in support of the unconditional conclusion of the new Union treaty. The need was stressed for the broader use of the potential of the mass media and primarily the party press in forming public opinion in favor of concluding a new Union treaty. To this end it was recommended that authoritative figures whose constructive stance would persuade people of the vital need to preserve our multinational state and prompt them to come out actively for its future as a Union of sovereign state be enlisted to produce items in newspapers and on television and radio.

The most important duties of the Union of republics include the defense of the country's sovereignty and territorial integrity, the safeguarding of its security, and the organization of defense and the leadership of the USSR Armed Forces. While there is a danger of armed conflicts the country needs a reliable defense. Comprehensively assessing the state and development prospects of the military-political situation, the 28th CPSU Congress stated that until guarantees of the irreversibility of the positive changes have taken shape, the military danger to the USSR persists. Under these conditions the fulfillment of constitutional obligations for the defense of the socialist Fatherland and the consolidation and maintenance of the country's defense capability and security at a level of reliable and reasonable sufficiency has been and remains one of the most important tasks of the entire people and the party and state.

The congress obliged the party organizations and all Communists to do everything to promote the consolidation of the authority of the Soviet Armed Forces, the enhancement of the prestige of military service, and the protection of the honor, dignity, life, and health of servicemen.

How are these instructions of the congress being fulfilled? Speaking at the Secretariat session, Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, member of the CPSU Central Committee commission for the party's military policy and chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Military Directorate, conveyed the commission's concern in connection with the anti-army manifestations which have occurred in a number of regions of the country. In particular it was noted that in some places intolerable conditions are being created for the activity of formations, units, and ships, and union legislation on universal military service is being blocked and slander and hostility with regard to the USSR Armed Forces are being fueled. This is leading to the aggravation of the situation around the troops and naval forces; is keeping back the work of the local military administration organs; and is leading to the infringement of the constitutional rights of servicemen and members of their families.

N.I. Shlyaga's speech cited numerous examples where as a result of the decisions of local authorities servicemen and their families are being completely deprived of registration at the place where the military units are stationed and at the same time of the right to work, to medical services, the provision of necessities, education for their children, and places for them in preschool institutions. N.I. Shlyaga spoke with alarm and indignation of how in a number of regions of the country, primarily in the Baltic and Transcaucasus republics and Moldova and the Western oblasts of the Ukraine, the anti-Army campaign aimed at disrupting the dispatch of the young reinforcement to the troops and fleets has been sharply activated with the start of the fall draft to military service. As a result there has been a considerable deterioration in the young men's moral and psychological and practical readiness for military services and there has been an increase in the number of refusals to serve and cases of desertion. Some local mass media continue to exert substantial influence on the formation of hostility toward the Armed Forces. They propagandize the refusal to serve in the "occupying" forces and the "illegality" of young men from the Baltic and Transcaucasus serving in the Soviet Army.

In the opinion of the CPSU Central Committee commission for the party's military policy, the tendencies connected with the further escalation of anti-army sentiments require the adoption of urgent measures by the state organs and by the CPSU Central Committee and local party committees. The CPSU Central Committee secretaries who took part in the discussion of this question supported the commission's proposals. During the exchange of opinions it was recognized that the situation requires immediate actions at both party and state level.

It was recommended to party committees of all levels that they analyze the course of the fulfillment of the 28th CPSU Congress resolution on questions of the party's military policy, give a principled assessment of negative phenomena with regard to the USSR Armed Forces, and also define measures aimed at strengthening the authority and raising the prestige of military service and protecting the servicemen's honor, dignity, life, and health. It was deemed essential to rebuff destructive forces more resolutely and to impart an assertive nature to the local party organs' activity aimed at explaining the party's military policy. It is important to enlist Communist people's deputies, party and Armed Forces veterans, and the party and ideological aktiv to this work. The task has been set of adopting vigorous party measures to improve the patriot education of young people and to prepare young men for military service.

Recently the regional organizations of individual political parties in the West European countries, primarily socialist and social democratic parties, have been displaying the desire to establish and expand cooperation with local CPSU organizations. The new leadership of the territorial organizations of the renewed parties of the East European countries is also displaying interest in renewing the contacts with their traditional partners in the USSR broken off in 1989. The CPSU local organizations' international ties have a long history. But the development of these relations in the spirit of the new political thinking, radical transformations in the political superstructure in our country, and the CPSU's new role and functions require substantial changes in the organization and content of local party ties, the Central Committee secretaries' speeches stressed.

Having examined this question, the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat decided, in accordance with the 28th congress instructions on the expansion of the party organizations' self-management and the autonomy of the union republics' communist parties within the CPSU, to transfer the functions of planning and organizing cooperation to the localities. Henceforth the local party committees are invested with broad rights both in the choice of partners from among the territorial organizations of the political parties with which the CPSU has official contacts and in the determination of forms and methods of collaboration.

There is no doubt that cooperation with local organizations not only of communist but also of socialist, social democratic, liberal, and other parties and public movements of democratic orientation will require of the CPSU committees flexibility, the more profound study of the content of their partners' activity, and painstaking preparation and familiarization with the forms and content of party-organizational work which is being conducted under the conditions of parliamentarianism and a civil society. Examples of this useful cooperation with foreign partners have been set by the Moscow Gorkom, the Volgograd, Grodno, Irkutsk, Leningrad, Ryazan, and Kharkov obkoms and a number of other obkoms. But in the majority of cases, the Secretariat session noted, party contacts with foreign partners are viewed from the angle of local economic matters or as tourism.

With a view to the broader dissemination and use of foreign experience in the practice of party work, the CPSU Central Committee departments have been instructed to systematically analyze the content of local party committees' international ties, to regularly generalize their experience, and to render assistance to CPSU committees in establishing and developing contacts with the territorial organizations of foreign political parties and movements. The editorial offices of central and local party newspapers and journals have been asked to give broader coverage to problems of the development of the CPSU's local ties, focusing attention on the content of cooperation and its results.

The session examined and approved the CPSU Central Committee work plan through the end of this year.

Tarazevich Views Union Treaty Issues

91UN0129A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 23 Oct 90 p 2

[Interview with G.S. Tarazevich, head of the USSR Supreme Soviet group on preparation of a new Union treaty and chairman of the Commission on National Policy and Interethnic Relations of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Zenkovich; place and date not given: "'We Must Create a New Union'"—first paragraph is RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA introduction]

[Text]*To separate or live in a Union? This is precisely the question we face today with respect to the future of our state. Public opinion is "swaying" from opinions and rumors, contradictions, and a lack of confidence in the future. A most severe economic and political crisis is splashing out onto the surface of our emotions, constraining our intellect, and paralyzing our actions. What sort of Union should we have? Should we have one at all? G.S. Tarazevich, head of the USSR Supreme Soviet group on preparation of a new Union treaty and chairman of the Commission on National Policy and Interethnic Relations of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, shares his views with TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Zenkovich.*

[Tarazevich] It is only natural, apparently, that emotions prevail in today's social relations. Extreme positions in repudiating the past bring other extremes to the surface—slogan extremism which is rocking our "Union ship" ever more intensely. Only a well thought-out approach and common sense can stabilize this process. Reason calls upon us to delve into the contradictions that have emerged and build a new life based on dialogue and accord. For it is impossible to destroy even part of the old state structure if we do not have reliably developed outlines of a new one. Meanwhile, we have been following the principle: engage in battle and see what happens.

One of the main reasons for the complexity of the current situation, in my view, is the fact that we are simply declaring construction of a rule-of-law state—our actions speak differently. Can society live in normal fashion if the contradictions in Union and republic legislation continue their ever increasing rise?

The confusion is growing into an avalanche. Moscow is not receiving sufficient quantities of sugar and meat because fuel deliveries to the Ukraine are short, as are shipments of mixed fodder to the Baltic republics. Karelia refuses to send timber to Russia since it is not receiving sufficient quantities of food. And Vladivostok is declared an "open city" by decision of the local soviet. Under the flag of sovereignty, republics have begun a struggle to divide up the public wealth and are attempting to cut themselves off from one another. True, there is good news in attempts to conclude agreements between republics, but until such time as there is a market they serve more as a consolation than a realistic means of transforming relations. This is why "Basic Guidelines in Stabilizing the Economy," adopted recently by the USSR Supreme Soviet, is reassuring. We see hope in the triumph of common sense.

We are discussing a Union treaty. Let us turn to the laws adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet—on demarcation of authority between the Union and federation entities, on economic relations among them, and on USSR citizenship. I agree that they are not perfect, that the principle of "from higher to lower," according to which they were adopted, pushes the republics away from this concept. But this is not the important thing, in my view.

It has been clear that these laws affect the sovereign rights of the republics. It would be logical to raise the question of their ratification by the republic parliaments. But this was not done. A response was not long in forthcoming—many republic declarations on sovereignty were adopted, as well as other legal measures in contravention of the USSR Constitution and USSR laws. Thus, the political background of the treaty process is showing an extreme complexity of formulation. In order to attain public accord, both the center and the republics must find a civilized means of resolving the contradictions.

[Zenkovich] But new problems are arising every day and piling one on top of another. It is no coincidence, is it, that transition to the market is being tied to the Union treaty?

[Tarazevich] Yes, the future of the Soviet state depends to a great extent on what path to the market will be chosen for the country by USSR people's deputies. They have now made their selection in voting for the "Basic Trends" proposed by the president. And this is a true achievement of perestroyka. But problems remain.

Today we often have occasion to hear that there is no need to worry about the fate of the Union, that the one power that will bind it together is market relations. We cannot repudiate this, of course. But we can hardly agree with such an assertion either. A single argument is cited here, as a rule—that we will build relations among republics just as this was done among states within the framework of the European Economic Community and, in other words, we will live like they do.

I believe this is simply delusion. The market can unite and bind entities together only when it becomes a reality itself and starts functioning according to its own laws. Were we already living under conditions of market relations, there would not of course be such a wide scope of phenomena dividing the country into segments.

But our society must look forward to a most difficult transition period. How long this will be—no one knows. And what if more than one decade is required for transition?

[Zenkovich] That long? But we saw preparation of the "500 Days" program, entirely scientific in nature...

[Tarazevich] Indeed, the goal was established here of creating the necessary conditions for transition to the market in 500 days. But with respect to forming market relations, I have to emphasize that this will be a lengthy process. True, the authors of this program are prescribing that "denationalization" of a significant portion of public assets will be accomplished over this period. I feel that such "directives" are dangerous. Is it possible that public assets can be redistributed in such a short period of time? This is a much more complicated process than nationalization. It affects the interests of all members of society. And it can develop normally only if it does so naturally, not on command.

The duration of the process will depend on three factors—to what extent the structure of our economy is adaptable to market relations (and there is no serious research in this regard), to what extent it will have to change in the transition period, and how effective will be the conditions created by the state for transition to the market.

[Zenkovich] In that same program adopted by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, there is a draft agreement on the formation of an economic union of sovereign republics. How can this document influence the Union treaty?

[Tarazevich] The concept itself of such a link could be supported. Yet the fact is—this agreement must be a part of the Union treaty dealing with economic relations in the new Union. But the republics have not yet given a final answer as to what kind of Union this will be. It is therefore not legitimate to determine beforehand the economic basis of the new Union. Although the idea is persistently expressed that if we establish our orientation on economic relations, it will be easier to resolve the problem itself. This concept entails a certain danger by showing disregard for the integrity of the problem.

Moreover, in my view political passions are inflamed today not so much because of the conditions necessary for transition to market relations as much as the concept of an economic basis for state structuring which accompanies the market concept. For in a joint session of the Presidential Council and Council of the Federation, and in the report of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session, the draft agreement on an economic union of sovereign republics "moved" ahead of the draft program of transition to the market. And this is not by chance.

The draft program of Academician Shatalin proposes to dismantle the system of managing the economy on the level of Union organs of authority—although there is mention in a published variation of it (RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, 26 September 1990) of the creation of a Union budget through federal taxation. The assertion that republics "independently draw up and employ a system of taxation," however, reduces the reference to federal taxation to something vague.

And so, the draft makes no provision for a hard budget for the Union state. Nor does it provide any clarity regarding Union assets or a Union monetary fund. The question arises—who will deal with such a state, who will confide in it?

In connection with the fact that only the Union republics are recognized in the draft as full-fledged entities of state regulation of the economy, autonomies obtain the rights of ordinary administrative entities. This is an encroachment upon the rights of dozens of peoples of the country and may lead to an exacerbation of interethnic contradictions. "Basic Guidelines" eliminates these contradictions to a significant degree.

[Zenkovich] But the growth of ethnic self-consciousness we see presently is a natural process. It is this that is generating aspirations to expand the independence of the republics, and consequently to weaken Union statehood. And it is not ruled out that the country will be divided into a number of independent states. What complications may arise in this regard?

[Tarazevich] Splitting the country into parts during the transition period to market relations is extremely dangerous.

First of all, the "distribution" of Union assets and property belonging to all of society to the republics and regions is not only difficult in practical terms, but would also require a great deal of time. Moreover, such a distribution is unfair if you follow the principle "everything on my territory is mine." By virtue of the distribution of labor that has come about, certain republics will end up richer, others poorer. A single national entity may "obtain" many times more resources, assets, and revenues than another. In other words, we must consider principles in order to avoid new conflicts.

Secondly, the collapse of Union statehood will deepen the gulf in existing economic ties between enterprises. Even today, interruptions in deliveries are putting industrial giants on the brink of catastrophe. A complete or partial cessation of operations for some of them might lead to massive unemployment, and possibly to social upheaval as well.

Thirdly, we must think seriously about the reliability of our defense. Is it possible to distribute tanks, missiles, and submarines—and in short time frames no less? There can be only one answer—no.

Fourthly, weakening the Union will threaten fulfillment of our international agreements and responsibilities, and will deprive the country of the opportunity to be a guarantor of peace and security among peoples.

All this, in my view, leads to a single conclusion—that we must not tear down but rather create a new Union. The path to achieving this is a difficult one, but for the time being it does exist. It consists of joint, laborious work, apparently of extended duration, on a new Union treaty. And this is already being carried out. The results of its first stage were recently examined, as we know, by the USSR Supreme Soviet in the report of Soviet of Nationalities Chairman R.N. Nishanov.

[Zenkovich] What kind of new Union do you envision?

[Tarazevich] A Union of sovereign republics, of course, where all peoples have the opportunity to realize their national aspirations of freedom and independence, where each citizen will be assured the appropriate social guarantees, and equal civil rights and freedoms, independent of place of residence or nationality.

But this requires that the new Union be a single sovereign state, with attributes inherent **to the state** — territory, citizenship, assets, finances, legislation, state structures. The republics, uniting voluntarily in the Union, transfer powers to it which are more effectively, more beneficially executed by joint effort through appropriate Union organizations.

A very significant problem that will have to be resolved in the treaty process is the problem of demarcation of assets. There is a divergence of views on this subject. But one must agree that if there are no all-Union assets, the very idea of the Union will become illusory. The Union must have its own assets, used by general consent and in the interests of all its entities.

Finally, the presence of a constitution is a mandatory attribute of a sovereign state. The constitution is designed to secure the political-legal foundations of the state, the basis for legal status of the individual, and the organization of state power. The Union constitution must be based on the Union treaty and not contradict it. The Union treaty—drawing it up and concluding it—is a matter not just for politicians but for all the people. It is therefore very important that these problems be discussed publicly and openly.

Economic Expert Views Escalating 'Crisis'

AU0911094090 Hamburg DIE WELT in German 9 Nov 90 p 14

[Interview with Vladimir Shenayev, deputy director of the Europe Institute at the Academy of Sciences and President Gorbachev's economic adviser, by Adelbert Reif; place and date not given: "USSR—The Crisis Is Escalating Into Chaos"]

[Text] [Reif] Professor, the economic development in the USSR is becoming increasingly unclear. What is going to happen now?

[Shenayev] We need the market economy. This is the command of the hour. Over the past decades too many programs have been presented but the system of central command economy has not changed in any decisive way. In December 1927, Stalin ordered the reckless pushing ahead with collectivization and industrialization. Stalin considered the market as a typically capitalist system of exploitation and, therefore, unacceptable for the Soviet Union. For some time, there was even the theory that we would not need any money anymore. Under Nikita

Khrushchev the first attempt was made to reestablish market conditions. The well-known economic theoretician Evsey Lieberman received permission to test his market economy ideas in a small enclave within the centralist system. Of course, this attempt was doomed to failure from the very beginning, and it was forgotten after one or two years. In 1979 Brezhnev turned up and again stressed the need for economic reform. However, everything just remained words.

In 1985 the call for a comprehensive economic reform in the Soviet Union was raised again. Starting at that time, one program was followed by another.

[Reif] One of the programs that is now being discussed is the so-called "500 days plan" of the Shatalin group. Is this again just one more program—or is it more?

[Shenayev] The program—not much more than an idea—was worked out jointly by G. Yavlinskiy, deputy premier of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], and S. Shatalin. In the meantime, Yavlinskiy has stated before the Supreme Soviet that he considers it impossible to implement under the current conditions. The preconditions for practical implementation do not even exist in their most basic fundamentals. We still have not abolished the administrative command system. There are still 98 percent of the enterprises state property and one cannot speak of any kind of independence that would deserve this label. In fact, 70 percent of all enterprises are still subordinate to the central branch ministry and the individual branch ministries. There is no wholesale market. No enterprise may purchase goods following its own free decision. It has to turn to the committee. And the State Committee for Pricing sets the prices.

[Reif] What is the main reason for the difficulties in implementing the transition from the central command economy to the market economy?

[Shenayev] Many Soviet politicians think that the market economy is just a kind of "new plan," which has to be implemented. Typical of that is the position of Soviet Premier Ryzhkov, who did advocate the establishment of the market economy and the sovereignty of the republics in a speech, but in the same breath he stated that he will implement all this under his command. The other problem is the struggle for power, the quarrels about powers, and the lack of political reforms. The representatives of the old command system are still sitting in their chairs. And there is a lack of laws. Instead of laws we have thousands of decrees. This results in the fact that the political conditions for a real economic reform simply do not exist in the Soviet Union.

[Reif] Can you give us an example for the quarrel about powers?

[Shenayev] Recently banks were founded in the RSFSR. But hardly had the banks received their orders from the president of the Russian State Bank, than they received other orders from the president of the Soviet Central Bank, which canceled the orders by the Russian State Bank. These orders were then countermanded by new orders from the Russian State Bank, whose president insisted that the commercial banks are subordinate to him and not to the president of the Soviet Central Bank. The orders went to and fro. These banks received two to three contradictory messages a day.

This example is also typical of other fields of political life in the Soviet Union. Even though much is being said about the sovereignty of the republics, in practice their powers are still very small. This has consequences. The Baltic republics, for instance, did not intend to leave the Soviet Union. They just wanted to preserve their independence. Since the Soviet leadership, however, considered these efforts as a destruction of the Union and did not want to engage in any negotiations, they lost their trust. What we need is a federation on a completely new basis: not vertical but horizontal links, which the republics establish with each other in the form of contracts and agreements.

[Reif] Professor, does the West's financial aid really serve the reform process in the Soviet Union, or are the millions and billions being poured down a gigantic drain?

[Shenayev] This aid can only push ahead the transition toward the market economy if it benefits the small and medium-sized enterprises and does not go to the center. In general, I place my hopes on the small and medium-sized enterprises because they start practically from scratch and have no or only small "old burdens." In two to three years—at least, this is our goal—20 to 25 percent of Soviet production is to be provided by small and medium-sized enterprises. But Western money cannot solve all problems. Poland is an example: The country has received many billions of dollars in loans. When later on a committee investigated, between $5 and $10 billion could not be found. We have to try to get out of the crisis on our own. But I do not hide the fact that I am skeptical whether the Soviet Union will achieve this within a short period. The economic and social crisis of the Soviet Union may last for one or two years at the most without sliding into absolute chaos.

But there are also a number of encouraging signs. After all, so far about 20,000 Soviet enterprises have been granted licenses for direct contacts with western companies. The RSFSR has started to establish free economic zones on which the ministries do not have any influence. These zones must be promoted. Perhaps Western entrepreneurs will not make much profit there immediately. But they can be pioneers and later they may take advantage of the fact that they were the first ones to be there.

[Reif] And what will happen if Mikhail Gorbachev fails? Will then the Stalinist system return?

[Shenayev] In the Supreme Soviet, including that of the RSFSR, there are still many representatives of the old command system. Therefore, in the current state of development, I do not completely rule out a return of the Soviet Union to a "tough command system." However, I do not believe that a Stalinist system with arbitrary arrests, concentration camps, and similar attributes of the old dictatorship will be reestablished. Time has passed over that.

Emerging Soviet Securities Market Described

LD1011111290 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 10 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Georg Mikhailin]

[Text] Moscow November 10 TASS—"This year there will be 40 billion roubles worth of shares on the Soviet securities market which is emerging in the country as privatisation proceeds apace. This figure will reach 180 billions by mid-1991," Eduard Tenyakov, president of the joint-stock "Fininvest" investment company told TASS on the eve of the Moscow Stock Exchange's inauguaration.

"The appearing securities are now being serviced by brokers' offices in 22 towns of the Soviet Union. There is a general brokers' office in Moscow. Several more offices are being opened in other major industrial centres. Stock exchanges are expected to arise from them eventually. They will handle up to 25 per cent of all the securities, belonging, as a rule, to major joint-stock companies," he said.

The first Russian exchange appeared in St. Petersburg in 1703. It was initially a commodity exchange. Later, when shares appeared in the country in 1827, it was transformed into a stock exchange. Russian joint-stock societies mushroomed in the country in the 1860's and their securities were mostly handled by exchanges. This is why the Russian Government issued regulations for the operation of stock exchanges in 1870. An independent stock exchange appeared in Moscow after that. Official exchanges were closed during the First World War, but there was a black market dealing in shares and bonds. Deals involving securities were outlawed in December 1917 and this sealed the fate of stock exchanges.

But history repeats itself and we are now going back to a market economy. Two years ago, when 70 joint-stock enterprises appeared in the country, the USSR Association of Commercial Banks called for the creation of stock exchanges, as market instruments for investing capital in various spheres of the national economy. After various bureaucratic difficulties, the above-said Association, the USSR State Bank, the Finance Ministry and the Fininvest Company agreed this August to set up a committee for the creation of a securities market. A commission, including representatives from 100 organisations, got down to the job already in September. But it lagged behind the processes of privatisation and the rapid emergence of joint-stock companies, and, moreover, it did not fit into the procrustean bed of bureaucratic structures. This is why the commission handed over its powers to the committee for the organisation of a conference of parties to the future securities market.

"The conference will be held near Moscow from November 12-14. It is expected to rally the parties to the securities market in an association and to institute a stock exchange," Tenyakov noted.

Intermovement Accuses TV of Slander

LD1111104590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA reports on an unexpected sequel to the USSR Intermovement congress held at the end of last week, following a report by Central Television Journalists that those taking part in the congress called for the physical elimination of Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin. This report is slander and deliberate disinformation aimed at the Soviet people, said one of the sponsors of the congress, Igor Lopatin, chairman of the Latvian Interfront council. USSR People's Deputy Viktor Alksnis is preparing to sue journalists from Television News Service and is supported in this by Igor Lopatin.

Kryuchkov Answers Journalists Questions

LD1211213690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Report by correspondent L. Kushnarenko on a meeting between KGB chairman Vladimir Aleksandrovich Kryuchkov and KOMSOMALSKAYA PRAVDA editorial staff at the KGB offices; date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] In the words of the KGB chairman.... A meeting with journalists of an individual newspaper in the offices that saw Dzerzhinskiy, Beria, and Andropov at different times took place for the first time.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA acquired this right through its independent opinions on the actions of the Committee for State Security, as well as by helping it through the action of buying up—it sounds strange, but KOMSOMOLKA readers know it—of buying up pistols, grenade launchers, and even more powerful arms from the population.

Comrade Kryuchkov answered journalists' questions on the budget of the organization, on fighting the mafia, and on the depolitization of the KGB bodies. In his opinion, the budget of the committee is immeasurably small when compared to the budgets of the those in developed countries. Mafia as a state within the state—this is Kryuchkov's expression—does not exist in the Soviet Union. We will unevitably achieve the depolitization of the state security bodies when a law on the state security bodies is adopted.

Kalugin Complaint Hearing Postponed

LD1111135490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1253 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Peskov]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 11 November (TASS)—The hearing at the Moscow city court of the complaint by Oleg Kalugin, former KGB major general and USSR people's deputy, against the actions of KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov—actions which resulted in Kalugin being deprived of his service pension—has been postponed again. [passage omitted]

The city court made its decision today after considering an appeal from USSR Deputy General Procurator Yanis Dzenitis filed on 31 October. This contests all the previous rulings by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] supreme court and the Moscow city court concerning Oleg Kalugin's complaint about illegal actions taken by Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who deprived him of his rank of reserve major general.

Kalugin's lawyer said that the appeal points to the fact that a resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers is a decision of a collegial body, even though Nikolay Ryzhkov might have signed that resolution as an individual. At the same time it also says that illegal resolutions made by the Council of Ministers may be contested in the USSR Supreme Court, given that the Council of Ministers is subordinate to that court.

Today's ruling from the Moscow city court says that "considering that the civil suit concerning Kalugin's complaint about the actions of the KGB chairman and other officials cannot be examined until the procurator's appeal has been examined in keeping with supervision procedures," the court considers it "necessary to postpone hearing of the civil suit until it has been examined in the RSFSR supreme court." The date of the hearing will be advised in due course.

Soviet Citizens See 'Bleak' Future

LD1111123290 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS—The future seems bleak to most Soviet citizens and very few believe things will improve in the next two or three years, according to an opinion poll conducted by the Soviet Sociology Institute among white collar workers and managers in Moscow, Alma Ata, Volgograd, Kishinev and four other cities.

The results of the poll were published in the POISK (Search) weekly magazine.

The widespread apathy and depression could threaten Soviet reforms, researches believe.

From 31 to 44 per cent of those polled said the country's economic situation was "dire." Many, however, believe a market economy is the only way out of the current crisis, since all other means have failed.

A total of 54 per cent of respondents think they will have to tighten their belts. Only eight per cent were willing to tighten belts. Thirty-nine per cent said they were willing only if the burden will be shared by all equally and 26 per cent supported austerity measures only if they improved the situation in the near future.

More than a fourth of those polled (27 per cent) flatly rejected any idea of austerity measures.

Soviet Communist Party's authority among the public has plummeted, with only two per cent looking up to the party to improve their living standards. Trade unions did equally poorly, with only 5 per cent of respondents pinning hopes on them.

However, 24 per cent said they hoped the state would give them a helping hand.

Soviet Employees Working Abroad To Retain Salary

LD1011174590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Text] Soviet citizens working for the United Nations and other international organizations will from now on cease giving up the lion's share of their salaries to the accountancy departments of Soviet missions. Previously, up to two-thirds of the income of every Soviet citizen working for an international organization was transferred to the account of the Foreign Ministry, while the Foreign Ministry used to take upon itself the responsibility for providing these people with accommodations and partially paying their medical expenses.

Gorbachev Orders Transfer of Chernenko Bust

LD1211185690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1659 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 12 Nov (TASS)—At the proposal of the Krasnoyarsk City Soviet of People's Deputies, supported by the Executive Committee of the Krasnoyarsk Kray Soviet of People's Deputies and the Krasnoyarsk Committee of the CPSU, the USSR president decreed on 12 November the transfer of the bronze bust of Konstantin Chernenko to the settlement of Anash in the Novoselovskiy rayon of Krasnoyarsk Kray. The USSR Supreme Soviet's decision of 9 August 1982 is recognized as no longer being in force.

The issues has repeatedly been raised in the media on the rightfulness of the site of the bust of Konstantin Chernenko, hero of socialist labor, who in his time was awarded a second gold medal, "The Hammer and Sickle". On the basis of the 9 August 1982 decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the bust was erected not in the native parts of the award-winner as was customary in such cases, but in the city of Krasnoyarsk.

The other decree of the USSR president states the following:

"To agree to the request of Valentina Golubeva and the petitioning of the Ivanovo Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies on the removal of the bronze bust of Valentina Golubeva erected in the town of Ivanovo.

"To recognize as invalid the second part of the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium of 2 April 1984 'on the award to a hero of socialist labor, a weaver from the Ivanovo worsted combine of the "Hammer and Sickle" gold medal, and the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium of 24 July 1984 'on the erection of a bronze bust of Valentina Golubeva, twice hero of socialist labor'."

"I always experience a feeling of great awkwardness about this monument during my lifetime." There is much that is memorable in these words of Valentina Golubeva, USSR people's deputy, general director of the Ivanovo cotton production association, who requested at the second congress of USSR People's Deputies that the bronze bust erected in her honor in Ivanovo be removed.

In the spring of this year the Ivanovo Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies responded to this speech with a petition on a decision on this issue at the relevant state level.

GLASNOST Chief Editor Outlines Paper's Plans

LD1211114690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Interview with YU.P. Izyumov, chief editor of GLASNOST newspaper by correspondent M. Zotov—place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Zotov] In recent times, your newspaper has carried very many interesting articles based on CPSU Central Committee archives. These articles have been generating great interest, particularly the open letter from Aleksandr Fadeyev, which was first published in your weekly. Tell me, please, what plans have you for 1991?

[Izyumov] We are planning—and have already started—to print documents from the private archives of Stalin, Andropov, Trotskiy, Bukharin, and other figures in our party. Furthermore, we want to provide a documentary account of how such notorious events as Khrushchev's resignation and Zhukov's disgrace came about. Such things as the Beriya affair. All this is contained in documents. Of course, the press has carried an awful lot of inaccuracies on these matters. It is our job to try to provide as accurate a documentary account of these events as possible.

[Zotov] Your newspaper was founded by the CPSU Central Committee. Will your GLASNOST newspaper be publishing a picture of the way the political forces are arrayed in the party's Central Committee and of the ideas propagated by those forces?

[Izyumov] Certainly! That is one of our main tasks. The present CPSU Central Committee comprises 400 people. Suffice it to glance at its composition and to compare it with the last Central Committee to realize that it is predominantly new. Totally fresh faces have come into it. Quite different people with different views. It is the same in the apparat: We have people who put every effort into perestroyka, while there are still people left who are against it, who do not want anything to change. It is our job to support those who embody all that is new in the party and to combat those who adhere to the old ways.

Chief Editor of Teacher's Newspaper Interviewed

LD1111220790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Interview with G.N. Seleznev, chief editor of UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA, TEACHER'S NEWSPAPER, by Marina Baranova; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Baranova] I am ashamed to say I am holding in my hands for the first time your UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA, and I think most of our viewers and readers have not come across your paper either. What is the reason for this?

[Seleznev] The paper is sometimes perceived by the public as a paper with a narrow bias, although we are a sociopolitical publication. The question now is to allocate five to six percent of our national income to public education as a whole, the whole system. You will agree that 155-ruble average pay for a teacher today in the country means that these people are simply beggars.

[Baranova] And now about your paper's collective of writers.

[Seleznev] Our collective of writers is very varied. We have now found a very new and interesting group of teachers. What helped us find it was the teacher of the year competition. As regards the schoolchild, LAD [as heard] has information on this—how to start teaching him, how he should be introduced to books, what stories to read to him at what age, how to correct his speech without recourse to professional logopedicians.

[baranova] I see you have some foreign authors in print.

[Seleznev] Next year we will introduce Dale Carnegie's tips which are very popular. Now we are printing two American psychologists, Robert and Jean Bayard, How to Treat Your Unruly Teenager. We have found another unique book, also, unfortunately, by an American psychologist and not our psychologists, called Shyness. The author of this book believes that 75 percent of the earth's inhabitants suffer from this complex. Most of our readers are not residents of Moscow, Leningrad, or big towns, but remote areas; it is difficult to get in touch with those areas, but the reader himself can help us increase the paper's circulation. Because however tight and restrictive the paper situation is, we have guarantees that subscribers to the paper will get it.

Journal Editor on Publishing Plans

LD1111161190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Interview with G.A. Zelenko, chief editor of ZNANIYE-SILA, KNOWLEDGE IS STRENGTH, magazine, by correspondent V. Minina; from the Newspapers and Magazines 1991 section of the "Vremya" newscast—live or recorded]

[Text] [Minina] (?A new time has come). How will you make use of the new opportunities, of the new conditions which have been granted to your magazine?

[Zelenko] Well, judging by the evaluations of our readers, we will succeed in doing that in a number of instances. We have printed and are presently preparing a series of materials on power engineering, let us say, on assessments of the energy balance and on, let's say, the problems and prospects of the development of nuclear power engineering.

We have published a series of materials on the problems of medical kinetics, and before the dawning of the epoch of glasnost, it could not have occurred to anyone to publish such poignant material.

And, finally, the problem of modern history. The second issue of next year will be devoted entirely to Russia at the beginning of the century, in its pre-revolutionary state. In that issue, the point of view of leading figures of Russia of that time are given, as is that of a number of major researchers of our time, and we have tried to devote resources to Russian life, which begins with problems of political history and ends with problems of cultural life.

[Minina] Your magazine is directed toward youth, it is published for young people. Well, now, young people are beginning to complain that too little attention is being given them in the solution of the most diverse questions. Can the magazine touch upon these contemporary problems on its pages?

[Zelenko] You rightly ask that question. We are striving, on the one hand, to talk about young people and their problems, and on the other hand, to present their, well, its state, from the point of view, let us say of, psychology, sociology, and some other points of view. We are preparing an article now, and we will publish it at the beginning of the year, on language and on hippie slang. We had an article about rock folklore, about the folklore of rock as contemporary folklore, that's to say, as a systematic musical and cultural phenomenon.

[Minina] Your previous issue carried this announcement: [video shows the following published in the magazine: The Gumanus Publishers and ZNANIYE-SILA are accepting subscriptions to the "Collected Works of I.A. Berdyayev" in four volumes.]

[Zelenko] The Gumanus publishing house was created as a joint enterprise and publishing house of the (Surus) Soviet-American cultural and initiative fund and the Political Literature Publishing House. The magazine's publishing program will be jointly executed with them. We intend to publish subscriptions for a four-volume collection of the works of Berdyayev, a collection of articles on Russian history, which is called "The Secret Centuries of Russian History." We are also working on compiling a collection of fiction under the title "Fiction of ZNANIYA-SILA Magazine."

New International Police Magazine Published

LD1011120990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Interview with Anatoliy Bezuglov, editor in chief of INTERPOL magazine, by unidentified correspondent, place and date not given; from the "Vid" program—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] The Soviet militia has joined the international criminal police network, and a new magazine—INTERPOL—has immediately been established in Moscow.

[Correspondent] Are you entitled to give your magazine this title?

[Bezuglov] We could have called our magazine MOSKVA if we had wanted to, and we would not have had to ask Muscovites.

[Correspondent] If it is not top secret, what controversial things will there be in your magazine?

[Bezuglov] As far as our current concerns go. I am interested in a rather out of the ordinary case, a case of extortion involving a senior lieutenant of the Committee for State Security [KGB], who has very influential relations. I am worried that he could, regrettably, evade responsibility.

Filaret Named Peace Movement Candidate Deputy

PM0911114590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Candidate USSR People's Deputy"]

[Text] The committee to elect a USSR people's deputy from the Peace Movement comprising the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace and the USSR United Nations Association, reports that Kirill Varfolomeyevich Vakhromeyev (Filaret), metropolitan of Minsk and Grodno and patriarchal exarch of all Belorussia, has been registered as a candidate USSR people's deputy.

Knowledge Society Chairman Released

LD0911110390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Text] Basic changes are in store for the all-Union Society for Knowledge. A decision to convene an extraordinary congress has been adopted. The issue of the concept of the renovation of the society will be on the agenda of the congress. At a plenary session of the board, academician Basov was released from the post of the chairman at his request. Frolov, vice president of the country's Academy of Sciences, winner of a USSR state prize, has been chosen as the acting chairman.

Roy Medvedev on Reappraisal of Revolution

PM0911095090 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 7 Nov 90 p 11

[Interview with historian Roy Medvedev by Marcello Villari; place and date not given]

[Text] Moscow—Never before have the celebrations for the anniversary of the October Revolution sparked such violent controversy and split the country and even the front combating perestroyka. Everything now is being challenged, including the Soviet state's date of birth, and each anniversary is no longer the unifying mark of this people's history. If so, why not abolish a festival which only communists now identify with? Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev—a dissident historian during the Brezhnev era, now a committed Gorbachev supporter who accuses Yeltsin of "Mussolini-ism" and of being a destabilizer—disagrees. "Such polemics certainly reflect the current reappraisal of the revolutionary events and of the opinion regarding the prime role of 1917 and of all that followed it in the subsequent 72 years Furthermore, we are now living in a pluralistic system, with parties of different political orientations, and it is natural for opinions about the revolution and what happened after to diverge. The fact that the arguments are so sharp stems from the fact that in the past 70 years there has been a kind of consecration of everything connected with the revolution, so some of the present extremism in people's assessments is a natural reaction to such a prolonged silence, though I also see many arguments that are wrong from a historical viewpoint."

[Villari] Roy Aleksandrovich, do you believe that the October festival should be continued or do you, like some "radical" intellectuals, believe that now, in the era of glasnost and democracy, it is the "democratic-bourgesois revolution" of February that should be celebrated instead?

[Medvedev] I have already written a book about this. I believe that the revolution was not inevitable: It was not strictly necessary, but it was no coincidence either. At every moment in history there are different alternatives, and the revolution prevailed at that time because Russia's ruling classes were unable to find any other solution to the problems of the time—from ending the war to the agrarian problem. Basically, a revolutionary situation had come about, and the Bolsheviks, who were revolutionaries, took power into their own hands as soon as the opportunity presented itself to them.

[Villari] But what happened in February was also a revolution against the old ruling classes.

[Medvedev] Yes, of course, they are different stages of the revolution. It is no coincidence that people in the West talk about the Russian Revolution of 1917 and that the October one is regarded not as a separate event but as part of a single process extending from February to October.

[Villari] Actually people also say that the Bolshevik revolution was a coup d'etat against the February democratic revolution.

[Medvedev] No, it was a continuation of the February revolution, not a coup d'etat against it. In October they did what it was not possible to do in February. We can say that the Bolsheviks' seizure of power begun in St. Petersburg soon turned into a revolution involving the entire country. As we historians say, a coup d'etat that is successful and that enjoys mass support is a revolution. For that matter, Lenin himself used the expression "the October coup d'etat," and so did Stalin. In any case, the aim that the Bolsheviks set themselves was certainly not to destroy what was done in February but to carry that revolutionary process forward, because they believed that the democracy born in February was too weak—for instance, it was unable to give the land to the peasants or to end the war with Germany.

[Villari] Mr. Medvedev, at the moment you are talking about the Bolsheviks' decision to build the first steps toward socialism, about the errors and crimes that accompanied that great and tragic event, and are repeating the same assessments for which you were expelled from the party during the Brezhnev era. But what now? Roy Aleksandrovich, Gorbachev compares perestroyka to a revolution, establishes an ideological link with the events of 1917, and even suggests that his policy marks an even more radical break with the past than the October did. In your opinion, does this CPSU, of which you remain a member, still play a leading role, or can we now regard it as finished, together with the old system of which it was an integral part?

[Medvedev] I believe that the CPSU can continue to play a leading role in perestroyka and the building of a socialist society, since, as Gorbachev says, socialism does not yet exist in the USSR. This, however, only as long as it carries out perestroyka within itself, too. In its present state, it is unlikely to succeed in building a new kind of socalism. At the party rally tomorrow (today—L'UNITA editor's note) we will see how strong it is, since hitherto we have only seen opposition groups in the streets. I went to a CPSU rayon committee meeting about the rally, and somebody said that he was afraid to take part. Who will defend us? I was asked. I replied: If the Communists, who are in government and still hold the power, are afraid to attend a rally, they certainly are not capable of building anything new. Whoever is afraid would do better to surrender his party membership card here and now. If there are forces in the CPSU capable of building socialism we will see them in the next two or three years.

[Villari] But is two or three years not too much? The CPSU is already losing power almost everywhere, at the center and in many republics.

[Medvedev] It is not long because the big changes in the party require this time. The fact that the party has lost power in a series of republics is not a tragedy, it may even be useful because it forces it to fully understand the threat of losing ground as a political force and to speed up its own internal perestroyka. The CPSU has been defeated in many areas of the country, even in Moscow, not because it is weaker politically but because it is not able to work in a multiparty system: It does not know how to fight a parliamentary battle, an election campaign, and so forth.

[Villari] So, according to you, the radicals are winning, in Moscow for instance, not because they are stronger but because they are more skillful?

[Medvedev] In Moscow, the CPSU is undoubtedly the strongest political force and the democratic bloc which is now governing the city is a combination of 10 to 15 groups which are weak but which cleverly fought the election campaign, exploiting people's discontent. However, I do not think they are capable of governing.

[Villari] However, we are now seeing that many intellectuals are abandoning Gorbachev, are moving toward the radicals, and are looking to Boris Yeltsin.

[Medvedev] Yes, I am struck by this fact because in my view, Yeltsin is not a radical, he is just a political adventurer. He has changed his viewpoint several times and he is not a man who is capable of stabilizing the situation and finding new paths for the country. Moreover, the CPSU has never traditionally had a good relationship with the intellectuals ever since the revolution.

[Villari] It seems to me that you do not accept the idea of an alliance between Gorbachev and Yeltsin as the only way of overcoming this desperate situation.

[Medvedev] I do not see any possibility of a strategic agreement between the two. That is my opinion. There may be political agreements on some points, but not long-term agreements because Yeltsin only wants power. He thinks that Gorbachev did well in the first phase of perestroyka and that now, in the new phase, we need new men, but when he says this he is talking about himself. He is popular because he manages to focus discontent, he is a demagogic populist. He is like Mussolini with the appropriate historical differences. He too was originally a socialist. Gorbachev may have made some mistakes, perhaps we really do need new men, but for the present I do not seen any alternative, certainly not Boris Yeltsin who is more a man of the past.

State Primary Organizations Deplored

91UN0233A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 3 Nov 90 pp 1-2

[Article by V. Loginov: "With Whom in the Party Does Power Reside?"]

[Text]**In comparison recently even many people would unhesitatingly have given as the answer to the question contained in the title of these notes the following: Power in the party belongs to the apparatus. However, a somewhat different version of the answer was also likely: Power is, of course, with those who are "upstairs!" Either way, the essence is the same: For decades, as the nucleus of the administrative command system, the party built its internal life and relations in its own milieu, also according to the "laws" of the former. Upstairs, the "generals," surrounding them, the apparatus host, below, the "rank and file" trained not to take even a timid step without the corresponding order.**

And, further, the "good-luck wedding generals...." Truly, reader, I refer to the considerable numbers of the composition of the elective party authorities elected, seemingly, merely in order to represent in silence and vote obediently at every conceivable activity and forum. It is, indeed, regrettable that in the mass consciousness, say, the CPSU Central Committee is still its apparatus, not the people directly elected (by the congress) to the Central Committee and to whom the apparatus, now, incidentally, not only considerably reduced but also reorganized, is subordinate.

Well, it is not fortuitous that the people and, as it happens, the party also, are "muddled" as to who's who. A specification of roles has begun today, it would seem. Evidence of this is that standing commissions of the Central Committee formed at its October plenum are getting down to work. One of them on the renewal of activity of the primary party organizations. The commission, like all the others, was formed on a voluntary basis. The result: Of its 37 members, 14 are party committee secretaries. Who knows better than the party organizers (as they were formerly correctly called) and the worker Communists, of whom there are many here also, the present problems of the primaries?

And now the first session of the commission.... But, stop. Some readers, I suspect, will have long been wearing a frown: sessions and meetings once again. The whole country is in session! Have we not had enough talk?! We are fed up to the teeth with it.... But a curious "coincidence": about which, with reference to the party, O. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, also discoursed, opening the session. He, the commission chairman, and all its members, as was shortly ascertained, are very disturbed by the fact that the party organizations are currently engaged primarily in the same thing in which they were engaged prior to the 28th CPSU Congress. What specifically? This is the problem—talk! And, further, with a sizable dose of pessimism and tears: Everything is bad with us; how difficult things are for us. And, as if in refrain: We do not know how to operate today, what we should be doing.... There are exceptions, of course, but they are as yet quite few, and we are talking and writing about them infrequently.

In the course of the exchange of opinions about the causes of the inadequate, to put it mildly, assertiveness of many primary organizations, the commission members called attention to a kind of paradox. Judge for yourselves. One frequently gets the impression that it is as if the primaries do not even read party documents. Even those published in the press.... Are they truly not being read? Or are people reading them cursorily, squinting with dismay through a corner of the eye at the garish headings of articles whose authors rapturously and provocatively criticize and debunk the party for its real, cited by the party itself, and imaginary sins?

Looking through the letters to the editor and on an office assignment, I have quite often been puzzled: The Communists, primary party organization secretaries included, are waiting, are impatient, it transpires, for the Central Committee to set forth its positions on this matter or the other. But these positions were set forth long ago and even confirmed repeatedly—in resolutions of the congress, in other documents, in speeches of the general secretary.... But, I confess, until I attended the session of the commission headed by O. Shenin, I had no idea what extensive proportions the "game of bad telephone line" had assumed in the party.

Do the primaries lack the ability to transform partywide guidelines into assignments "for themselves?" Has the sense of responsibility been blunted? The primaries should be turning to the new rules somewhat more often. After all, they deal both with self- management and the power of the party masses.... And whereas earlier all this was merely declared, it is now **guaranteed.** How many demands and proposals were received prior to the congress—not from just anywhere but from the "masses": It is necessary to extend the rights of the primaries! They have been.... Why, though, has there not been an addition of assertiveness? Why have the rules not exerted a salutory influence on the life of the primaries?

Complex questions, you will agree. But here, in my opinion, is the answer, if the statements of the commission members on this score are collated: The Communists have become strongly habituated (it is with good reason that it is said that habit is second nature) to living in accordance with instructions and orders from above which even yesterday were regulating literally everything, "from and to." But what were they dealing with all those years? Nuts and bolts. Man was an attachment to a machine. Not a personality. It has been said: Control of activity is being abolished; in addition, new parties and movements have arisen, without any instructions from above, demanding a place in the sun, and—"We do not know what we should be doing...."

"Many people," A. Chausov, secretary of the Chelyabinsk Foundry party committee, insisted, "do not understand—and did not understand when they joined the party—that the CPSU is a political party. This is both our serious problem and misfortune. Whence the continuing drain from the party.... People are saying: What should the primary organizations be doing now? I have been a member of the CPSU since 1971 and have been doing party work for 10 years and I believe that it was before that we had nothing to do. And involved ourselves with what we should not have. The new parties and movements are small as yet, but virtually everyone in them is already or nearly a political fighter. And each party wants to show that it is a political organization. And, you will observe, every one, although, seemingly, fighting for the depoliticization of the work force, is trying to penetrate precisely the work force—I judge from the situation at our works: with its own programs and demands, with leaflets and such. But we Communist 'rank and file' and party organization secretaries, seeing this, throw up our hands for some reason or other: What should we be doing? It is now, I am sure, that the time for our work has come. The most important task is ensuring that each Communist become a political fighter."

"We," A. Aleksandrov, first secretary of Leningrad's Moskovskiy Rayon Party Committee, picked up where Chausov left off, "were never a professional political organization and are today becoming an organization of dilettantes. In the years of perestroyka the composition of party committee secretaries with us has been renewed 60-70 percent and has reached the point where many of them now do not even know how to conduct a meeting. Being a secretary is not only not prestigious but dangerous even. He is absolutely unprotected against every possible kind of attack and the arbitrary action of management. Today a secretary, but tomorrow? There is often complete uncertainty here.... We need, I believe, to urgently collate available experience of the social protection of our party activists."

I leaf through my notebook and once again hear, as it were, the voices of P. Moskalenko, worker at the V.I. Lenin Machine-Tool Plant Association, which is in Kirghizia; Yu. Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and party committee secretaries P. Melnikov, from the 50th Anniversary of the October Revolution Mine of the "Karagandaugol" Association, V. Lyakishev, from the Moscow Automotive Industry Technology Research Institute, and A. Teplenichev of the Novolipetsk Foundry....

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA offered Aleksandr Ivanovich Teplenichev a platform about three months ago, incidentally. He is a most experienced party official. It was with good reason that he has been elected a member of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat. His concerns have, following this, mounted, naturally. But, I am convinced, he simply must work on the Central Committee commission for renewal of the activity of the primary party organizations also. This is his element.... And it would make sense; as I learned at the first session of the commission, he would learn something here. Submitting his experience also to the judgment of the members of the commission—this would be useful too. The huffing and puffing of meetings is now being cursed and attacked. Is it not on this "excuse" that the Communists have in places altogether stopped meeting? Previously at the works, the party committee would meet twice a month, and this was considered "often." And there were recommendations even to the effect that once a month might be better. Now, however, their party committee meets every week. The meetings usually last just one hour. Any controversial, acute issue is raised for discussion (how many such issues there are today!), and for Teplenichev it is very important that all 17 members of the committee become involved in the discussion. And people are being transformed before our eyes: Thought has been engaged, and a sense of responsibility for the common cause and, ultimately, for the fate of the party has been awakened! The party organization secretary council has been operating efficiently, "on the same terms," for eight months now. Doing away with the confusion and passiveness in the primaries, Aleksandr Ivanovich believes, is possible only by enlisting members of the elective aktiv and, step by step, all Communists in collective search for the best accomplishment of urgent tasks.

And one further "old acquaintance"—Georgiy Aleksandrovich Bukharkov. Recently, in October, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carried an interview with him. "I Have No Intention of Playing at Give-Away" was how the interview was entitled. Does his character show through? When he was a delegate to the 28th congress, Bukharkov was elected a member of the Central Committee, he was a mine worker at the "Donetskugol" Association's Chelyuskintsev Mine. In September he was elected—unexpectedly for many people, but not for those who know Georgiy Aleksandrovich—secretary of the Donetsk City Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine....

Still hot, evidently, from the tumultuous events occurring in his city (that same miners' congress was not your "activity du jour"), Bukharkov well and truly, in my opinion, heated up the already seemingly hot debate at the commission session. Georgiy Aleksandrovich fervently, but cogently cut through to mother truth: Unless the CPSU primary organizations show daily by deeds that they are not "obsessed" with their own, narrow party concerns, but are defending the interests of the work force and each worker against the vicissitudes of the market, petty tyrant administrators and demagogues of all stripes, they will simply prove to be unnecessary at the enterprises.

It is extremely important, Bukharkov firmly believes, to also establish businesslike, equal contacts with the new parties, with the workers movement particularly. And we simply cannot play give- away with anyone here. Or panic. Even if situations arise that are similar to that which some supporters of forcible depoliticization, so to speak, are attempting to parade in Donetsk currently. They have shown on the basis of actual experience, they say, that the CPSU is not necessary at the mines—a sector to which not a single Communist has been admitted has been created, and things are going "superbly" there, if you please. An obvious juggling of the facts. A clear attempt, with a tinge of provocation, to disorient the workers and disrupt the long-standing good relations in the collectives.... But people are beginning to see the light and are comprehending increasingly well who is worth what and who is preoccupied with what.

Yes, the primary party organizations currently have a multitude of problems. Countless, perhaps. It is for this reason that the commission intends returning to them again and again, extending the analysis of them, and collating bit by bit the experience being engendered locally. At its suggestion even zonal conferences of secretaries of the primaries will be held in November-December. It has been decided to begin preparations also for an all-Union scientific-practical conference on problems of party building.... And this is just the beginning. A practical beginning.

...So to whom should power in the party belong? Not the apparatus. And not those who are "upstairs." In what their omnipotence has resulted we know full well. The results of the long-standing "experiment," so to speak, are in hand. A long-standing slogan has been "All Power to the Soviets!" This for the country. I would by analogy propose a further slogan, for "internal use" in the CPSU: "All Power to the Party Masses!" Is there something dismissive heard in respect of us Communist "rank and file" in the "party masses" word combination? Well, we will, possibly, in time find other words also. Although it is not essentially a question of words but of deeds....

However, today is not the time for slogans. It is a time for action.... And in order that it is the "masses" in the party that take power, it is of exceptional importance, of course, to enhance the role of the primary party organizations and restore to them their dissipated dignity and authority. A difficult task? Complex? But this is an indispensable condition....

From the editors: In publishing these lines RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA proposes that party organization secretaries and Communists share their thoughts on problems of a renewal of the activity of the primaries. We will try to publish the most interesting opinions in the newspaper or forward them directly to the CPSU Central Committee standing commission. We will unfailingly take your thoughts into consideration in the development of party topics in RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA.

Economic

Ryzhkov Chairs 1st Foreign Currency Meeting

LD1111173290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1635 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 11 Oct (TASS)—The first session of the Union-Republican Foreign Currency Committee, established by USSR presidential decree on 2 November this year, was held in Moscow today under the chairmanship of Nikolay Ryzhkov.

In his address at the session, the USSR Council of Ministers chairman described the tasks facing the committee and voiced a number of thoughts regarding the organization of its practical work under the conditions of the preparations underway in the country for the conclusion of a new union treaty, and also regarding efforts being made by all republics to stabilize the national economy and to transfer to a market economy.

Stepan Sitaryan, chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers, reported on proposals for meeting the paramount needs of republican and national economic complexes for imported resources in 1991.

Those taking part in the session noted the need to take additional measures to expand exports and ensure that all Soviet enterprises and organizations fulfill promptly and without fail their commitments to foreign partners.

The discussion of questions proposed during the committee session was constructive and ended with the adoption of accords concerning the further work of the committee aimed at consistently resolving the country's foreign currency and financial problems.

Abalkin Views Paris Economic Meeting Results

PM1211144390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Nov 90 Union Edition p 4

[Interview with L. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by correspondent Yu. Kovalenko; date and place not given: "Loans for the USSR? The West Will Allocate Them Only for Specific Programs"]

[Text] Paris—It was already reported that an international meeting of high-ranking politicians and specialists directly involved in solving the problems of transition from central planning to the market in the Soviet Union and in other East European states has taken place in Paris. Also taking part in it were leaders of the world's major financial and economic institutions—the IMF, the World Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development—and EC Commission President Jacques Delors.

Your correspondent asked L. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to sum up the results of the meeting, which was organized by France.

[Abalkin] Speaking in France, I said that we must solve nine-tenths of all our problems by ourselves. Nobody will help us if we don't help ourselves... At the same time, creating a market, stabilizing the economy, and being included in the world economic system are also necessary conditions for solving the tasks facing us. Success largely depends on the extent to which the West realizes our problems and assesses the seriousness of our intentions to switch to the market. Here there is a fear that the resources being obtained are being used ineffectively and are vanishing like water into sand. Therefore an understanding of our position and an appreciation of the details of our transition are of fundamental importance... The fact that representatives of another five East European countries also gathered in Paris increased the meeting's effectiveness. And although neither the signing of contracts nor the conclusion of agreements were the point of discussion, the general political climate and human mutual understanding, without which no agreements can be carried out, were important.

[Kovalenko] L. Stoleru, secretary of state for planning under the prime minister, said that France, in helping us switch to the market, is in the position of a copilot who does not himself make decisions but, during a complex maneuver, is ready to give assistance using his experience. How do you assess France's role in this process?

[Abalkin] A high-level Soviet-French commission was formed in spring 1990 on L. Stoleru's initiative, consisting of several working groups on the most diverse problems of the market, including both the market structure proper and questions of state regulation, the employment system and social protection in France, and so on. It is the French market model that is very close to us. Its originality lies in the fact that it incorporates quite a powerful state sector. It also has a well developed social protection system, based on values which are close to us on the historical, political, and psychological planes.

L.I. Abalkin noted that there are now two positions in the West regarding the processes taking place in the USSR. First—the wait-and-see position: Let them, they say, sort it out themselves there, and when it gets really bad they will come cap in hand. And that is when we will make up our minds whether we should help them. France's approach is completely different. It is a position of political wisdom, farsightedness, nobility, and humanity. When the problem of aid arises they should not wait, people in Paris think, but while of course taking sensible and careful account of their own interests, they should enter into contacts on a wide scale.

[Kovalenko] Can we count on assistance by leading financial institutions like the IMF, the World Bank, and others?

[Abalkin] How they appraise the situation is very important at the moment. EC Commission and IMF working groups were formed, which were furnished with all particulars concerning the state of the Soviet economy and its prospects. They were charged with preparing a report. Its first version has already been compiled, and now finalization of the document is in progress. Whether these institutions embark on large-scale investment or not will depend on how experts appraise the situation in the USSR, its creditworthiness, and its political stability.

The question of the USSR's priority development trends was also discussed at the current meeting, L.I. Abalkin said in conclusion. It was noted that a market, especially on our country's scale, presupposes the reliable functioning of transport and communications systems. The agro-industrial complex was also named among the priority spheres for capital investment... In other words, money will be allocated not simply in the form of loans but for certain targeted programs which boost the whole economy's efficiency.

Moscow Stock Exchange Founded 12 Nov

LD1211164490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Soviet businessmen and bankers will soon be able to trade capital on the Moscow Stock Exchange. It was founded today during the first day of the conference being held near Moscow by 187 Soviet enterprises and banks which are participating in the securities' market now taking shape. Up to one-quarter of the shares in some of the biggest share companies and banks in our country will be handled on the Moscow Stock Exchange.

Official Examines, Criticizes Bank Reform Law

PM0911112790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Interview with V. Vinogradov, chairman of the Moscow Banking Union, by I. Zhagel: "Finances Do Not Brook Amateurism"; place and date not given]

[Text] The drafts of two most important market laws—"On the USSR Gosbank [State Bank]" and "On Banks and Banking Activity"—received first-reading approval in the Union legislature without any fuss or bother, you might say. This would seem to testify to the high quality of the documents. But what is the view of representatives of the new wave in banking? V. Vinogradov, chairman of the Moscow Banking Union, which unites most of the commercial credit institutions in the capital, and chairman of the Mosinkombank [expansion unknown; possibly Moscow Foreign Commercial Bank] Board.

[Zhagel] Vladimir Viktorovich, you don't need to make hearsay judgments about the draft banking laws. I know that you even participated in their discussion in USSR Supreme Soviets committee and commissions. What is your view of the documents?

[Vinogradov] I believe that they fall down for the same reason as other laws previously adopted in our country. While generally adhering to a progressive course, they are often declarative in nature and cannot be applied in a whole series of concrete economic situations. And this provides scope for bureaucracy and complicates the creation and functioning of new banking structures.

[Zhagel] For example?

[Vinogradov] Let us begin with the extreme vagueness of the wording on the grounds on which the USSR Gosbank can remove the chairman of the board of a commercial bank. In general nobody should have the right to remove him apart from the council of shareholders. In extreme circumstances the council could be given some recommendations or defects could be pointed out. But that's all!

Admittedly it is now being said that people lack knowledge and so central organs should have more rights vis-a-vis the members of commercial bank boards. OK, assume they can fire us. But in that case we must be told specifically for what failings—squandering money, lacking specialist education, or being locked up for drunkenness. Otherwise tyranny will flourish.

[Zhagel] So it is evidently not only a question of possible interference in personnel matters?

[Vinogradov] Certainly not. Take lien law for instance. It is formulated in the most general terms: Enterprises and private individuals are responsible for the repayment of the credits they receive. Otherwise their property can even be sold off. But how is this to be done in practice? How do you declare a plant bankrupt and close it?

Here it must be stipulated at once that you should not imagine that commercial banks want to get rich only by bleeding enterprises dry. On the contrary, we are interested in the normal functioning of our partners in industry and agriculture. And in order to help them we have to have the right to strengthen financial control of our clients' activity. But no provision has yet been made for this.

I could go on. But what I have already said is sufficient to conclude that there is as yet no sign of any facilitation of commercial banks' activity. Yet they are declared to be the fundamental basis of the new banking system.

[Zhagel] It's astonishing. We have recently heard a good many radical statements by USSR Gosbank spokesmen. Even greater radicalism is displayed by the government and parliament of Russia. Yet draft laws are still appearing in imperfect form.

[Vinogradov] When I heard both sides' speeches at the sessions of USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions, I felt they were simply not listening to each other, they did not want to listen. I'm not going to say who is most arrogant. But the fact is that despite the July decision by the president on pooling all efforts to prepare banking legislation, people did not pull together.

Yet the reorganization of the country's credit and finance system should have been made one of the most important components of a Union treaty. Here all ambition should have been discarded, even sacrifices should have been made. Because it is only by strengthening the banking system, and through it the ruble, that we can halt the economic isolation of the republics, which are beginning to protect themselves against the export of material assets and the import of useless "toy" money.

[Zhagel] You say everyone should have given some ground. But in the Russian Government they think that if they follow the central authorities' lead they will end up with a banking system which will prevent them implementing their economic reform program.

[Vinogradov] In my view radicalism should be backed up by professionalism.

[Zhagel] Do you think that that is what the relevant Russian organs lack?

[Vinogradov] Yes, that is my personal opinion. In the end let us judge people not by their good intentions but by their deeds. What do these show?

There was, for instance, the Russian legislature's decision on converting all specialized banks on the republic's territory into commercial banks by the beginning of next year, together with the breakup of the previous monopoly structures. But it went no further than declarations.

Of course you could say that there was substantial opposition to these plans. But, on the other hand, no practical attempts were made, no real mechanisms were created to commercialize the banks. So where is the professionalism? With what are we left? The specialized banks have largely preserved their structures. Some reacted to the Russian legislature decision by speedily turning themselves into joint-stock companies, but without yielding an inch of their monopoly positions.

Moscow's radically-minded leaders could also be mentioned. While I sympathize with them on the whole, I must observe that they are making serious blunders in the reform of the capital's banking system. It is their doing that a number of giant banks are now being created, which will stifle all the competitors.

For instance, the city administration of the USSR Bank for Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development is supposedly being transformed into the main bank for the reconstruction and development of the capital. But it has an incorporation capital of about 1 billion, and thus a circulating capital of 20 billion. Who can compete with that? Will this benefit Moscow?

[Zhagel] But could it be that you are simply afraid of competition? What if you were offered such prospects?

[Vinogradov] Actually we have been. Representatives of the republic parliament came to us recently with tempting plans. To re-register the Mosinkombank as the so-called First Russian Commercial Bank "Business Russia," which would exist on a joint-stock basis with the backing of foreign capital. Here we were promised all kinds of benefits, including desirable city-center premises.

Incidentally, the majority of commercial banks in the capital do not have decent conditions and are located just any place. It is virtually impossible to get this matter through the Moscow City Soviet. Which is simply incompatible with the constant declarations of the desire to develop market relations in the city, of which the banks form the basis.

[Zhagel] And how did you react to the proposal to become the First Russian Bank?..

[Vinogradov] We refused.

[Zhagel] Why?

[Vinogradov] So as not to be involved in helping to create the appearance that the Russian government and parliament are succeeding in pushing forward the reform of the banking system. How can you call it reform when the basic structures have not been touched?

[Zhagel] Can these criticisms of republic bodies be regarded as approval of the USSR Gosbank's action?

[Vinogradov] At least they have more qualified specialists there. They could make a substantial contribution to preparing and implementing the reform. However, the USSR Gosbank still cannot cut the umbilical cord linking it to the government and other central departments.

Judge for yourself: Even to draw up the present draft laws took it about two years. All because it was constantly looking over its shoulder and the work was amended again and again from above. And even now a certain transitional period is envisaged for bringing the future laws into force. God only knows what lies behind this formula.

Let me stipulate: In a subtle matter like banking structures you can't shoot from the hip. But let us go into more rigorous detail about this transitional period.

[Zhagel] What do you think should be done here?

[Vinogradov] All our troubles come from the lack of professionalism. If we want to avoid re-inventing the wheel, we should invite Western experts to help finalize our banking legislation. And perhaps we should not grudge the resources for a special course of lectures for people's deputies. Perhaps not for everyone, but without fail for the members of certain committees.

Of course they may not want to listen to Western experts. But they absolutely must listen to the demands of representatives of commercial banks. Whichever way you slice it, today we are already beginning actually to work in market conditions, and we have a better idea than anyone of the possible dangers here.

Askenov Comments on Market Reform Efforts

LD1111133890 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Askenov]

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS—To move to a market in unison or separately?—This problem, although excluded from the agenda in the Soviet and Russian parliaments, has become crucial for millions of people.

The issue is extremely important, since Russian launched its "500 days" reform programme independently on November 1. The programme includes measures that can only succeed if implemented through the country, especially those aimed at stabilising the rouble.

The effort ran into difficulties immediately—after the Soviet parliament opted for a compromise concept—a patchwork of several reform programmes.

The tug-of-war threatens to jeopardise all efforts. Lawmakers are expected to raise the issue in the Soviet and Russian parliaments expected after the recess. Constructive and effective results can be expected only if the Soviet and Russian leaders cooperate. These sentiments were voiced during the November 6 meeting in the Kremlin, marking the 73rd anniversary of the October revolution.

"Both Gorbachev and Yeltsin should understand that the continued showdown between the two harms their popularity," People's Deputy Leonid Bliznov said.

Conspicuously, Boris Yeltsin attended the official celebrations both in the Kremlin and Red Square, together with Soviet leaders. Participants in both the official and alternative demonstrations called for joint actions. The consolidation of society is crucial for the Soviet Union and Russia, participants said.

Odessa Unions Oppose Coupon Use in Sales

914D0034A Moscow TRUD in Russian 3 Nov 90 p 1

[Article by TRUD special correspondent D. Romanov: "Coupons for Complete Happiness?..—Odessa Trade Union Organizations Against Decision of Ukraine SSR Government"]

[Text] Odessa—All other concerns have receded into the background. Today, only one thing is being talked about in enterprises, on streetcars, in lines, and at home: consumer booklets and coupons that were introduced by the government of the Ukraine. Residents of the republic will be able to purchase food and other commodities only with them. You come to a store, select something, tear out a coupon for the necessary sum, and you pay in money. Moreover, the coupons are issued for 70 percent of total wages. You buy goods for the remaining 30 percent at markets, in commercial stores, and in restaurants.z

The aim of the innovation would appear to be good: to protect the Ukrainian consumer market. The comment of V. Fokin, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukraine SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], which was published in almost all Ukrainian newspapers, is called more than eloquent: "The consumer booklet is a blow against speculators." But, nonetheless, why were ration cards, invitation purchase cards, and other "protective measures" received by the population with understanding, while the introduction of coupons evoked the most contradictory rumors, gossip, and even panic? The answer is simple: The decree of the Ukraine SSR Council of Ministers virtually completely reshapes our life as consumers. And, what is more serious, as citizens.

I make no pretense about a detailed and deep analysis of the decree: Specialists will certainly do this. We will try to check on the provisions of the decree with normal common sense living experience. And no matter whom we talked to on this sore subject—workers, trade union workers, scientists—everyone expresses the same thoughts.

"We held a meeting at the plant at which the decree of the Ukraine SSR was discussed," says P. Vykol, chairman of the trade union committee of the Odessa "Neptune" plant and a member of the presidium of the Odessa oblast soviet of trade unions. "All are categorically opposed. And this is not simply groundless unacceptance. At the very least, we are being treated dishonestly. Here is a simple example that everyone is familiar with. For years people stood in lines for the purchase of a television set, refrigerator, or washing machine, and they pay out money. But what now? For example, after laying out 750 rubles for this television set, a person automatically dooms his family to a hunger ration: He will not be sold even a package of macaroni in a grocery store for money not backed up by coupons. There is also the difficulty that nowhere does the decree talk about some kinds of guarantees for providing commodities for those 70 percent of wages covered by coupons. There is only one conclusion: At the expense of a still greater reduction in our already wretched purchasing ability, the government is attempting to provide an imaginary "abundance." Note: Instead of increasing the production of commodities and food products, we are called on to tighten our belts in behalf of implementing someone's insufficiently considered idea.

"We sent a telegram addressed to the Ukraine SSR Supreme Soviet," explains Ye. Mytkovskiy, secretary of the Odessa trade union soviet, "in which we protested the adoption of the decree. In the opinion of practically all of the oblast's trade union organizations, the decision will lead to a sharp increase in prices, a depreciation in wages, wild excesses in the shadow economy, and, in the final analysis, a drop in the living standard of the workers. And individual rights are being infringed upon substantially.

The opinion of the presidium of the trade union soviets did not emerge in lobbies, and it reflects the mood of all those who work, that same "people" which, as always, is the last to learn about the next experiment on them.

Literally rejecting beforehand all critical remarks directed against the decree, V. Fokin declares in his comment: "Whom will the new system not benefit? The speculators, corrupt elements, and underground "millionaires who conceal their ill-gotten wealth" ["koreyko's"]. It can be expected that they will attempt to discredit the planned measures."

Is it possible that Comrade Fokin actually does not understand that the "koreyko's" of all stripes are ready to smother the authors of the project with kisses for their heartfelt concern for them. By comparison with this, the decision to raise the price of gold, which brings millions of rubles to those who have it in large amounts, is a trifling matter. Now, the "shadow economy manipulators" have a rare and splendid opportunity to make money literally out of thin air: The coupon will become an item for speculation, that is, not even the commodities, but the potential capability to buy them.

"The decree 'On the Protection of the Consumer Market in the Ukrainian SSR,' says Doctor of Economic Sciences Professor S. Novikov, "received the same evaluation from people who are far from the ABC's of economics and among economic scientists. The introduction of consumer booklets is a concealed ration card system. But instead of saying this openly, the government is introducing coupons—an addition to money. There will not be more goods as a result of this, and, moreover, it is not only dishonorable, but it is even a mistake to pretend that all of our troubles come from the speculators. But the haste with which attempts are being made to foist the decree on us, apparently, is caused by the fact that someone is not in much of a hurry to introduce a Ukrainian monetary unit. In short, in my opinion the actions of the government have no relationship to economics. It is a purely political action. And it is a step that puts us farther away from a genuine market."

Agricultural

Effects of Poor Potato Harvest Viewed

PM1211153190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by M. Petrov: "What Has Happened to Everything That Was Cultivated?"]

[Text] The State Committee for Statistics has stopped collecting reports about progress in the harvest. This means that yet another "fight" has essentially been concluded. The latest gifts from the fields, which had to be "extricated" using incredible efforts, were vegetables and potatoes. But now these too now been removed from the fields and duly accounted for. Will there be enough for the winter? That is the question.

Alas, the situation here developed as if according to a previously written scenario, just like with the grain. The prospects for the harvest were good. But the actual results do not live up to expectations, to put it mildly. Ten percent of the area sown for potatoes was not harvested. The first thing that comes to mind by way of justification is the bad weather. But was the weather alone to blame? No. Even in normal not very fruitful years some of the potatoes have remained under the snow. It is hard to establish how much this actually accounted for, although losses caused by the intractibility of the bosses in the past were probably smaller. This year economic accountability relations made some leaders furious. In some places the war finished deplorably: Farms unwilling to pay helpers for their labor lost most of the harvest.

Because of their inability to cope with the vegetable and potato harvest on their own, kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] reduced the area sown this year by 200,000 hectares—roughly by one-tenth. But look at the natural order of things: That is the area that remained under snow. It is as if life itself is teaching us the rational use of land and labor resources: Sow however much you will be able to harvest using your own forces. Or at least as much as you can take on without moaning about assistance and emergencies. Give the rest to private farmers—they will not waste it.

But that is life forcing us toward common sense. With our economy, we are fighting it tooth and nail. However many potatoes we harvest, for example, the percentage of losses is well known beforehand: 30 percent through diseases, and another 20 percent through damage during transportation and storage. It is simple arithmetic: The greater the harvest, the greater the waste. As a matter of fact, even just one-half of what is cultivated would be sufficient to meet our needs. Is the planned surplus not too great? Here we need to think about the shortcomings in selection work and the bad quality of the equipment used for cultivating and digging the potatoes. Incidentally, this year virtually all the potatoes that will be stored for winter in Moscow will be imported—ours are unsuitable for storage because they are unhealthy and sickly.

At this point I would like to take the opportunity to answer the angry letters from readers who recently accused the author of these lines of calling people to sabotage. My previous articles made the point that sending teams of people from the cities every year to harvest the potatoes is no more than a fruitless attempt to prolong the death throes of the administrative edict system: There is a lot of fuss, but the result is practically zero. And, let's face it, explanations to the effect that the country does not lose anything from the "potato" trips, and that the people who go out into the fields are people that are not really needed in manufacturing, are ridiculous. If only this was remotely close to the truth! Why would they keep so many unnecessary people in plants and factories?

The country does lose something, it loses a great deal during the potato harvest and then in acquiring potatoes from abroad; for example, from Poland and Germany, which is what happened this year.

Another heavy blow struck the normal supply of potatoes and vegetables to the cities—the drop in contract discipline. By the end of October, 7.8 million tonnes of potatoes were purchased in the country—exactly one-half of contract agreements were fulfilled. Contract performance in Russia was only 41 percent, 54 percent in the Ukraine, 65 percent in Belorussia, 79 percent in Lithuania, and 52 percent in Latvia. It was no better with vegetables: Contract deliveries fulfillment was only 67 percent for the country as a whole. The categorical bans that republic authorities imposed on exporting the produce from their territories proved to be more fearsome than any fines imposed for not fulfilling commitments. And indeed, it could not be otherwise. Fines in our country still represent only very modest sums of money. The situation can scarcely be explained merely by the weakening of the center's power. The situation testifies rather to the primitive level of our economic relations. There is no Union treaty which would regulate the republics' powers and mutual economic relations. This proved to be fertile ground for many voluntarist decisions. And as a result of this—existing economic links are being curtailed or completely broken, and new ones are not being established.

Yes, we are approaching this winter with alarm. Only one thing is keeping us calm: The vegetables and potatoes that were not delivered on contract have not rotted. It may be that they will still appear in the markets in winter. O. Birichev, chief of the Moscow City Main Administration for the Fruit and Vegetable Industry, expressed the following supposition about partners' present unreliability:

"We failed to receive 7,000-10,000 tonnes of vegetables from each of the Central Asian republics this year. Either they decided to keep them in order to ask for higher prices for their products later, or they sold everything to the cooperatives."

When asked to comment on the draft decision on the privatization of trade in Moscow, which is now being discussed in the Moscow City Soviet commissions, O. Birichev replied that transferring the vegetable stores into private hands now, when the market lacks even prime necessities, is scarcely going to resolve the problem in a radical way. Although, according to him, this step is quite sound and we will certainly be unable to manage without it in the future.

Rural Cooperatives' Lack of Rights Viewed

PM0911105190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Article by USSR People's Deputy V. Yermakov, chairman of the Russian Union of Consumer Trade Cooperatives: "Enough of Offending the Countryside; Rural Inhabitants' Interests Will Be Defended Only by an Independent Cooperative Movement"]

[Excerpts] Anyone who has bought goods in cooperative stores deep in the countryside knows that prices there are higher than in state trade. The difference is small but every little counts as they say—over a year it runs into 800 million rubles for the consumer cooperative system as a whole. And the rural inhabitants of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] pay over half this sum.

This markup, rightly dubbed a "carting supplement" among the people, is essentially an additional tax that rural inhabitants are forced to pay for living in remote villages. [passage omitted]

Administrative diktat has transformed the consumer cooperative movement, by nature a nonstate movement, into a virtual contracting party of the state. The rural population, represented in its overwhelming majority by levy-paying members [chleny-payshchiki], has ceased to see in the consumer system the defender of its interests. What defense is there here if today, in order to buy goods, the rural inhabitant has to sell agricultural products or raw material, pay his levy to the consumer society, and also pay additional expenses for the shipment of goods, that is that selfsame notorious carting supplement. It is indeed here that debts running into millions have accumulated and not only does it seem that no one intends to return them but no one intends to repeal the unfair requisitions.

Changing the attitude toward an essentially independent cooperative movement is not simple. Even the USSR Law on Cooperatives has not put an end to the lack of rights of the levy payers and the consumer societies and their unions. The distribution of market commodity stocks between the city and the countryside continues to be done on a monopoly basis—by the state organs. They deprive the cooperatives of the right to dispose of the output which has been purchased from the population and the collective and state farms and which has become their property and in a number of places impose unjustified prices. Here this is done by the organs of party and state power which do not bear direct economic responsibility for the results of actions of this kind.

I personally am convinced that no one will take account of the cooperatives until they achieve true legal protection. The Russian union of consumer societies has already come out with a legislative initiative—it has submitted to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet a draft law "on consumer cooperatives in the RSFSR." The new legislative act is designed to determine precisely and to preserve the rights of this truly popular socioeconomic system. To protect the consumer interests of the population which is being served—levy payers and cooperative organizations—the draft law provides for the supremacy of decisions taken at grassroots level and not the other way round, as is done now. And relations between the consumer cooperatives and the state should be built only on a contractual strictly economically accountable basis.

Enough of orders. The territorial organs of power in their mutual relations with the consumer cooperatives must be guided only by the legal norms stipulated by the law. And if economic and other organizations want somehow to influence the cooperatives' affairs, let them become collective levy-paying members. Our doors are open to all.

Scientific

Sidorenko Rejects Report on VVER-440 Reactors

LD1211210290 Moscow TASS in English 2029 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 12 TASS—Soviet second generation VVER-440 nuclear power units were designed and built taking into account the present safety standards and meet all modern requirements, Soviet First Deputy minister of Power Engineering and Industry Viktor Sidorenko told TASS today. He spoke in connection with THE NEW YORK TIMES publication about the possible closure of some reactors of this kind in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

Sidorenko recalled that there were 16 units of this kind, including some that are regarded as the world's safest. Two such reactors operate at a nuclear power plant in Finland.

THE NEW YORK TIMES says that the German Government has allegedly told Soviet officials that planned [as received] to shut down in the middle of December five nuclear power reactors the Soviet Union had helped build in East Germany, because it viewed them as incompatible with safety requirements and extremely expensive to reconstruct.

"THE NEW YORK TIMES refers to the nuclear power station near Greifswald, where four power units operate, each with a capacity of 440,000 kilowatt, and an experiemental power unit with a capacity of 70,000 kilowatt," Sidorenko explained. "These are first generation VVER-440 reactors that were built in accordance with projects mainly worked out in the sixties. At that time they were consistent with the then safety regulations. Over the past decades, technical thinking has naturally progressed, and power stations with these reactors no longer comply with modern requirements."

"I had a meeting with the environment minister of united Germany recently. His position is not so categoric as the American newspaper would have it," Sidorenko said. "No mention was made during our conversation of shutting down the reactors. According to the minister, the economic aspect of reconstructing the units was being considered."

Sidorenko called on the Soviet and foreign mass media to report about nuclear power engineering with utmost truthfulness and avoid erroneous statements.

'Warning Strike' at Baykonur Cosmodrome

LD1011221190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Report by unidentified announcer from the "VZGLYAD (VIEW) segment of the "VID" (VIEW AND OTHERS) program]

[Text] Employees at the Baykonur cosmodrome would seem to be Librans [as heard]. There is alarming news from there. A warning strike was held at Yubileynyy airport at 1800 hours on 6 November by the military unit which in 1988 provided the backup for the Buran landing. The demands of the strikers are [word indistinct] social and economic. We trust that the chiefs of the cosmodrome will not confine themselves to routine investigations and the identification of troublemakers.

Cosmonauts Prepare for 2 Dec Joint Space Launch

LD1211185890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1513 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Report by correspondent Vladimir Belyayev from the Zvezdniy Gorodok studio on preparations for the 2 December joint Soviet-Japanese space launch—live]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] The crew has finally been named, so on 2 December, at 1130 [0830 GMT], the crew will be launched from Baykonur cosmodrome and will include Flight Commander Viktor Mikhaylovich Afanasyev; Flight Engineer Musaki Romanovich Manarov [Musa Manarov], who is hero of the Soviet Union and holds the record for the longest stay in space, one year; and the Japanese cosmonaut, our journalist colleague, Toyohiro Akiyama.

The crew has been formed, and I gave you the launch date.

The Japanese crew member will return on 10 December, but Viktor Afanasyev and Musa Manarov will return to Earth on 10 May. [passage omitted]

The management of the Japanese TBS [Tokyo Broadcasting System] company, which is organizing the flight, thinks the flight will be a big contribution to the coming visit of President Mikhail Gorbachev to the Land of the Rising Sun. It was announced here that the company would do a great deal even during the flight to make the meeting as friendly as possible and to benefit our two countries as much as possible. [passage omitted]

[Valeriy Vladimirovich Polyakov, the cosmonaut who will monitor the flight] [passage omitted] It will be a very interesting flight.

The flight will start with a representative of Japan, and then the men will stay on for 169 days.

The work will be not only interesting but also difficult because there will be three to five spacewalks: the number will be determined during the work itself. Overhaul work will have to be done on the hatch, which the previous crew did not manage to do.

The main thing is that this flight is really regarded as a profit-making flight in the interests of our economy. There will be both technological experiments and biotechnical ones, including very interesting ones on ecological monitoring of Earth, and much more. [passage omitted]

The interdepartmental commission declared today the technical readiness of the crew, and our representatives also said that the cosmonauts are healthy and that they are ready for flight. [passage omitted]

Military

Armed Forces Deputies Hold Talks in Moscow

Meet With Yazov

PM1211210590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed "Our Correspondent" report under "Direct Line" rubric: "Large Meeting of Deputies"]

[Text] Moscow, 12 Nov—KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has already reported that a meeting will be held on 13 November between armed forces deputies of soviets at all levels and M.S. Gorbachev. And on Monday morning deputies gathered to hear replies to the questions they posed to the USSR defense minister at an 8 November meeting.

There were more than 200 questions. And the answers to them from deputy defense ministers and other officials took four hours. Of course, the main problem worrying military men is how our Armed Forces are going to develop. Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov told the audience among other things that the concept of the military reform devised by the Defense Ministry was examined recently at the Defense Council under the USSR president and was largely approved.

I shall dwell on just a few aspects of this long discussion. The deputies in Moscow are from all the Union republics, but for reasons that are well known the questions that were raised particularly keenly were on the performance of military service and the position of military servicemen and members of their families in the Transcaucasus, the Baltic region, Moldova, and the western Ukraine. Thus it was no coincidence that it was noted, for example, that a draft USSR presidential decree has now been prepared on making the transfer of draftees to the Transcaucasus purely voluntary.

There were new questions during the present dialogue from deputies representing the Baltic republics. What are servicemen to do in Latvia, for instance, where just a few days ago the authorities announced that the "occupation army" is being deprived of all social and material benefits. It is intended that servicemen will begin paying for their children's tuition in kindergartens and schools. Indeed, what are they to do? This is no longer a question for the Defense Ministry alone to decide.

That is the first question to the USSR president. Let me remind you that the meeting with him will take place at 1000 on Tuesday [13 November].

Meet With Gorbachev

LD1311073990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0716 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 13 Nov (TASS)—The meeting of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev with servicemen who are people's deputies and who have come to Moscow from throughout the country has just begun in the building of the Central Academic Theater of the Soviet Army.

Opening the meeting, Dmitriy Yazov, USSR minister of defense and marshal of the Soviet Union, noted that more than 1,000 people's deputies of all levels were taking part in it.

This is the Soviet leader's fourth meeting with servicemen. Issues will be considered at the meeting connected with the fulfillment by Soviet people of their constitutional duties in the defense of the socialist fatherland and with the maintenance—within the necessary limits—of the defense capacity of the country in the light of the military-political doctrine of reasonable sufficiency.

It is expected that the basic discussion will unfold around problems of strengthening the authority of the Soviet Armed Forces, enhancing the prestige of military service, and issues connected with protecting the honor and dignity and the life and health of servicemen and their families.

Yazov Outlines Problems

LD1311101790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 13 Nov 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text][Announcer] Now a report from our correspondent on the meeting President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is holding with people's deputies who are servicemen; a meeting that is taking place now.

[Correspondent Stepanyuk] The meeting was opened by Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union Yazov. He announced that present in the hall are 1,100 people's deputies from all levels—from rural and village soviets to the republican and Union Supreme Soviet level. In essence, they represent the entire country. Also taking part in the meeting are representatives of ministries and the mass media. Describing the current situation in the Armed Forces, Marshal Yazov said:

[Begin Yazov recording] In the Army, esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, no small number of problems have accumulated. There are negative moods, tension, and dissatisfaction in the service. We are alarmed by anti-Army attacks, too, and difficulties of a social order. We need assistance from the state and the people. But much today depends also on us, on our maturity, on our being self-possessed, well-organized, and capable of good work. [end recording]

[Stepanyuk] I will keep you informed through the day on the progress of the meeting.

Military Transfers Spark Airport Protests

AU1211122690 Paris AFP in English 1208 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, Nov 12 (AFP)—Protests by families of Soviet servicemen have disrupted air traffic at two airports in the southern Ukraine and in Karelia, the independent INTERFAX news agency reported Monday.

About 100 people, members of the families of airforce pilots serving near Zaporozhie, in the Ukraine, blocked the local civilian airport runway for several hours to protest plans to redeploy the regiment to central Asia, INTERFAX said.

In a similar protest, which began Saturday and involved about 100 women and children from a base near Petrozavodsk, north of Leningrad, demonstrators blocked civil aviation runways and later military runways, the agency said.

Protests over military transfers had earlier been reported among Soviet troops serving in East Germany, but this was the first time such demonstrations were reported at home.

The withdrawal of Soviet forces from Eastern Europe and cut backs in defence forces have led to large-scale redeployments of troops in the country, at a time when servicemen are complaining about poor living conditions, notably in housing.

Ochirov Views Military Aspects of Union Treaty

91UM0070A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Interview with USSR Supreme Soviet Defense and State Security Issues Committee Deputy Chairman Colonel V. Ochirov by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Parliamentary Commentator Captain 2nd Rank V. Urban under the rubric: "Politics: Assessments and Predictions": "The Union Treaty. What Awaits the Army?"]

[Text] It is difficult to list all of the questions and answers which society expects from politicians. One of these questions is the Union Treaty. And perhaps here the Army has the most unclear position. But the problems need to be resolved somehow or other.

Our Parliamentary Commentator Captain 2nd Rank V. Urban conducted an interview about this with USSR Supreme Soviet Defense and State Security Issues Committee Deputy Chairman Colonel V. Ochirov.

[Urban] Valeriy Nikolayevich, the first question will be the most difficult. The Parliament has already been working on the elaboration of the Union Treaty for over a month. But we have not yet seen any particular results. Do you agree?

[Ochirov] Not quite. This is a topic for a long, serious conversation. But you cannot get by without general assessments or without a sort of excursion into the essence of the issue. Shall we begin with this?

[Urban] Fine. It appears to me that the deputies were already manifesting a certain frivolousness in the assessment of the state of our federation during the discussion of R. Nishanov's report on the course of the summer consultations with working groups from the republics. In many speeches—and I carefully studied the transcript—quite private issues were raised. From this point of view, a discussion on defense issues is noteworthy. At times we have had to think that the deputies are not even delving into the logic of the development of events in the country and in the world and do not know what our people and their partners in the international arena expect from them.

[Ochirov] I would also like you to tell me about logic. Right now when I have become totally involved with these issues, I understand: There was some sort of lack of reasoning at that session. Take the unplanned discussion concerning Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's pamphlet "How Do We Revitalize Russia?" [Kak nam obustroit Rossiyu?]. It is difficult not to agree with the deputies' assessments and afterward the President of the USSR's words but it is not deputies' business to initiate debates on literary works. It is already long since time to be tolerant toward writers' opinions. It is no accident that the dynamics of the conversation were lost—how do we structure the Union. This affects the country's defense.

Right now the committees and commissions in principle are actively elaborating issues associated with the Union Treaty. But one does not sense coordination among them. So, one can be mistaken in the main thing. For us the main thing is expressed in safeguarding the country's defense capability. So, I basically agree with how you posed the question.

[Urban] We recently learned that M. Gorbachev has already distributed a draft Union Treaty to republic leaders. A new question immediately arises here: Consequently, the Supreme Soviet somehow remains out of the loop?

[Ochirov] This is just the initial draft. And I assure you it will be significantly amended. As they say, there is no end to the work here. Let us take just the purely military "sector." Committee members and our experts are scrupulously studying the documents submitted by the republics. We are also conducting negotiations on defense aspects of the future Union with deputies of republic parliaments. This is important because ultimately, precisely the union republic Supreme Soviets will ratify the Union Treaty which has been concluded.

[Urban] But much was already clear during the summer. Working groups had mainly agreed that defense would remain within the center's jurisdiction. Are new problems really possible?

[Ochirov] While everything has occurred and is occurring on the level of expert assessments. Moreover, the situation in the republics is also changing with the adoption of declarations of sovereignty. Let us take Belorussia. Belorussian Parliament deputies with whom I met recently announced: Their declaration states that the republic is justified to have its own armed forces and that in the future it will become a nuclear free zone and a neutral state. As a result, the question is raised with my interlocutors about what kind of field of activity we leave them. So, we are going to have to conduct these consultations in a specific manner and to seek compromises. Let us also add here the fact that the Baltic republics and Georgia are not participating in this process.

[Urban] Those republics are precisely where the status of our ground and naval forces is least defined right now. It is sufficient to recall the decisions adopted by the parliaments and governments of the Baltic republics. These are also a restriction of servicemen's voting rights, a ban on residence permits, and termination of the allocation of plots of land for housing construction. We can continue listing examples but perhaps these words express the very essence of the matter: "The Army must know its place....", stated by Latvian Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Gorbunov during a Moscow Radio interview. And meanwhile we get just statements of the general plan from the center and appeals which local authorities no longer even heed. And next? We would like to know the committee's opinion?

[Ochirov] In the Baltic republics, yes and in several others, conditions are being prepared for creation of their own armed forces. This is a reality to which it is impossible to close our eyes. As for the Army's legal status, this is my deep conviction: Right now, everything in our country must be resolved through intergovernmental agreements. The sooner, the better. Otherwise, the problem will be driven deeper.

[Urban] Incidentally, several proposals on the future structure of the Armed Forces and internal troops were submitted for discussion of the union parliament. One of them has become quite widely disseminated right now: This is all-union strategic professional formations and republic (territorial) troops or their own internal troops. The prognoses for realizing this idea are quite varied.... But has the committee conducted an analysis of this problem?

[Ochirov] Of course. This is one of the committee's primary tasks. Here are the arguments that we must recognize. Right now the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] is striving to create a municipal militia that the Soviets would be responsible for and the militias in turn would be subordinate to the Soviets. But why not act in the same way with internal troops? All the more so since many republics have already adopted their own laws on permanent armed formations to maintain public order. The republics will defend these positions. But the functions of the local, let us put it this way, subunits must be strictly regulated so that they do not become the cause for any kind of destabilizing processes.

[Urban] Naturally opponents of this idea submit the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan as an example. Let us imagine the participation of ethnic troops in them. This is a another "stimulus" for tension.

[Ochirov] I am talking about principles and prospects. But, having cast off all prejudices, republic leaders must extinguish conflicts like the Armenia-Azerbaijan one through negotiations.

[Urban] There also is no unity in forecasts on the future strategic forces. Let us take just one of the Union Treaty drafts that won third prize in the Interregional Deputies Group competition. There it is written that in the event a republic secedes from the confederation, it receives its share of nuclear and chemical weapons in proportion to the size of its population. It will also be difficult to overcome these delusions.

[Ochirov] I agree. Here we observe precisely that frivolousness which we have already discussed. Any sober-minded politician in the world understands that, with the present quantity of nuclear weapons, we need to deal with a partner who has total control over his own arsenal and single command and control over these weapons.

[Urban] I think that this criticism also applies to the parliament itself. It is sufficient to cite excerpts from the speech of Armenian Deputy L. Arutyunyan: "You are laughing in vain when you pose the question about distribution of weapons...." The country's national wealth must be divided because it has been created by the peoples and there is the highest justice in this. I am not saying that the world will agree with the fact that our weapons will be divided into 15 and maybe even into 53 parts, that the individual republics will have nuclear weapons—I would not want and do not suggest this. I ask you to understand that this issue will be raised...." Does this mean that we will divide them?

[Ochirov] People nevertheless think that the highest justice is peace and not parceling out arms. At least many colleagues do not share the statements of the respected Lyudmila Akopovna. To divide arms means to weaken first of all our statehood. This will also play a negative role in the international arena. I have quite frequently had to meet with Western parliamentarians and experts on disarmament issues. Their opinion on this issue is simple. I sense that they are seriously troubled by the "divisive" trends in our country.

[Urban] Maybe this will at least convince some of our radicals since they are not interested in the opinion of their own people. So I will cite the lines about the situation in the USSR from the influential NEW YORK TIMES newspaper: "How to maintain control over nuclear weapons when power moves from the center to the republics, regions, and even to the cities? And if a fierce civil conflict suddenly breaks out, will the desire not arise in someone to get around this control?"

[Ochirov] This is just one aspect of the problem. No less important for us is, so to speak, the intra-union part. Therefore, the committee will defend strict center control over nuclear weapons.

[Urban] But does it not seem to you that the center will resort to serious compromises on other issues at the expense of the Army?

[Ochirov] This will pass against the committee's will but such is reality. Under current conditions, agreements between the republics will not be concluded without this. But the committee will add that the Union Treaty will clearly state the republics' legal obligations to the Armed Forces with regard to social and political guarantees of servicemen and members of their families. Furthermore, this should not be limited by declarations and it is necessary to have precise standards on financing the Army in particular. It is worthwhile to provide for the supremacy of union legislation on defense issues. And the republics must reinforce this.

[Urban] Consequently, adoption of laws on defense and on the status of servicemen is being delayed for now?

[Ochirov] Unfortunately, this is so. But many factors of future military reform which are being stormily discussed right now will disappear by themselves after conclusion of the Union Treaty.

[Urban] Valeriy Nikolayevich, your prediction about the conclusion of the treaty is quite interesting. Hypothetical time periods have been indicated for now. They are the end of this year and the beginning of the new year. Do you think it will be that way?

[Ochirov] Hardly. You see how many ambiguities and how few compromises there are. Furthermore, the risk exists that in the near future we will not succeed in organizing a completely new all-union economic market. And we plan to create the new Union precisely with the aid of and on the foundation of the market.

Far East Forces Reduced

LD1111132190 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Text] Our special correspondent, Valeriy Chebotaryev, has visited the Soviet Far East and met with senior Soviet Army commanding officers there. He asked them to speak about the steps being taken to reduce military confrontation in Asia and the Pacific. The deputy commanding officer of the Far Eastern Military Region, Major-General (Nikolay Bukhteyev) said: The unilteral reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces announced two years ago is nearing completion. Since the time that announcement was made, substantial changes have occurred in the troops stationed in the region. For example, there was a considerable cutback in troops, and the army and corps boards [as heard] have been abolished. Talks are underway about a total demilitarization of the Soviet/Chinese border. I think that as measures of confidence in the military area are strengthened in the Far East conditions will be shaping for further steps to reduce the troops of the Far Eastern Military Region.

Speaking about the troops that remain in that region, Major- General (Nikolay Bukhteyev) said this: First of all, the operational and combat training of that region's troops has undergone substantial change. At present, this training is strictly defensive. In fact, all the exercises in the region in the past few years have been of purely defensive nature. Motorized infantry units are also acquiring a new structure of organization and personnel. The aim is to conduct strictly defensive actions. In keeping with this, said Major-General (Bukhteyev), within the past two years in the region's armed forces there's been considerable cuts in the number of tanks, artillery systems, combat planes, and other arms.

And here is what our correspondent has been told by deputy chief of staff of the USSR Pacific Fleet, Rear Admiral (Nikolay Zaytsev): The reduction of the Pacific Fleet has been going on under a plan, says the rear admiral. In the past five years over 60 naval ships have been pulled out from it, including large surface vessels and submarines. Besides that the fleet has greatly limited its operations in remote parts of the ocean. Our presence in the Vietnamese port of Cam Ranh has been reduced. The port now mainly plays the role of logistic support for the passing ships. At the same time the problem of lowering the naval activity in the region is still acute. A major role in reducing this activity will be played by the implementation of such confidence building measures as informing other countries in the region of major exercises and naval movements, especially of those near the borders of some particular country or its allies, and inviting foreign observers to these exercises. By the way, the Pacific Fleet already has this kind of experience. Of course, said Rear Admiral (Zaytsev), these proposals do not cover all the possible measures. But as they say, a big road begins with the first step.

Commentary Views Arms Dumping in Third World

LD0911204790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Commentary by V. Ovchinnikov; from the "International Panorama" program]

[Text] The participants in the Helsinki process are soon to sign an agreement in Paris on the radical reduction of conventional weapons in Europe. An accord has been reached to take thousands of tanks, armored personnel carriers, guns, and aircraft out of combat-force levels.

It would seem that all this should only be a cause for rejoicing. But serious analysts in the West are voicing their concern at something that should in fact be worrying us as well—how to avoid a pseudo-conversion, in other words, the transfer of the arms race to the Third World. Effective measures are needed to ensure that the reuniciation of confrontation between East and West does not give rise to a threat from the south, so that the combat hardware that the Warsaw Pact and NATO are taking out of service do not flood into the developing countries, fanning the coals of old regional conflicts and kindling new ones.

The end of the Cold War has not as yet ended the demand for weapons. Although the military rivalry of the two superpowers is receding into the past, the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are scarcely going to rid themselves rapidly of the tendency to regard their military potential as the best guarantee of state independence and international prestige. Forecasts predict that the annual volume of arms exports in the world could again rise to the record level seen in the early eighties—50-60 billion dollars. This must not be allowed to happen, let alone with our own involvement. And here the West has additional cause for concern.

First, it is the countries of the Warsaw Pact that are going to have to cut more tanks, armored personnel carriers, and guns. And second, it is the USSR and its allies that are in particular need of hard currency at the moment. Will the East resist the temptation of improving its finances by selling written-off weapons? One would like to hope that the relevant Soviet departments will be sufficiently far-sighted to avoid easy solutions which will subsequently cost us dearly.

Now that the Cold War has receded into the past, I believe that the time has come to set up something along the lines of the infamous COCOM Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls system. But it should not be to conceal the West's scientific and technical achievements from the East, but to prevent the shift of the arms race from north to south and thus to save the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America from new regional conflicts. After all, each of them, as the example of Iraq's aggression against Kuwait testifies, creates a threat to general security.

Commission Discusses 1991 Military Budget

LD1111214990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1506 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 11 Nov TASS—Today the USSR Supreme Soviet Defense and State Security Committee met and examined the draft 1991 ministry of defense budget. USSR people's deputies and representatives of the USSR Council of Ministers, the State Planning committee, and the USSR Ministries of Defense and Finance took part in the discussion.

The speakers noted that the draft does not fully reflect the prospective expenditures for the coming year. Significantly greater funds will be needed to provide for the withdrawal of Soviet forces from East Europe and for their facilities in the areas where they will be relocated. Serious problems will arise due to with the transition to a market economy.

The session's participants noted that the increased warmth in the international situation and the destruction of whole classes of weapons have not led to the complete removal of a military threat. Meanwhile, the Soviet people must be assured of their security, and one of the guarantors of this is the preservation of parity in the military fields.

The committee decided to set up a commission to complete work on the USSR Ministry of Defense budget and to continue discussion of it at one of the forthcoming sessions.

Warships Depart Leningrad; One Hits Bridge

LD1111161990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Report by M. Chirkov; from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] These warships are today leaving the Neva in daytime for the first time. But not everything is going well. This ship has just struck one of the sections of Leytenant Shmidt bridge with its superstructure. But one way or another they are bidding farewell to the city. But surely not forever, though the political situation in the city is such that it is fully possible this might happen, that the latest turn of history might be reversed, that we might forget what happened yesterday and erase it from our historical memory. Let us not repeat the error of those generations, which having at one time or another tried to disown their native country's past, brought it to where it is today.

Col Gen Shaposhnikov on Promotions System

91UM0080A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Nov 90 First Edition p 2

[Letter from Captain I. Krotov of the Western Group of Forces, published under the rubric: "Openly About What Hurts;" followed by commentary by Air Force Colonel General E.I. Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the Air Force and USSR deputy minister of defense—"Will He Never Be a Major?"]

[Text] He has fallen far behind his friends of the same age. At the age of 32 he became a captain, and has been such for five years now. Other people of his age are trying on the lieutenant colonel's shoulder boards for size.

However, it was he, Nikolay Kostenko—a flight commander, Air Force pilot first class—who recently became the subject of a military newsletter; it was he, Kostenko, whom Major L. Kokhanchuk, regiment party committee secretary, described as "an officer who enjoys high prestige and possesses marvelous human qualities."

"What kind of fairness can we talk about if even such people as Nikolay remain unnoticed?" was the frequent indignant question of his colleagues. I must add that the public's opinion of Kostenko fully coincides with the official one: Recently his commander and the political officer both signed a document evaluating the officer very highly.

Now Nikolay recollects more and more often words the from a song by Vladimir Vysotskiy about a captain who would never be a major.

Who has "wronged" the worthy officer?

Not the regiment command, in any case. It was his commanders who applied the relevant order of the USSR minister of defense and the regulations on officer military service in the USSR Armed Forces to ask that Kostenko be promoted to a military rank one step higher than the rank his present position calls for. Unfortunately, nothing came of it.

The letter came back from the division headquarters with no explanation of the denial provided. It bore the following inscription: "Return to the unit with no action taken on the commander's decision..." It was signed by the personnel office chief. Curiously enough, the column headed "Decisions of Immediate Commanders," which contained the approvals of his commander, regiment political officer, and the chief political officer of the combined unit, did not have any entry by Colonel I. Kokoulin, who theoretically had the last word. Igor Mikhaylovich did not say or write anything in explanation of his decision; even the regiment commander was not told anything. The only fact that could be learned from a telephone conversation with the personnel office was that the letter was sent back because Captain Kostenko had not flown a sufficient number of hours as a flight instructor.

How convincing is this argument? The appropriate documents on the order of officer military service in the USSR Armed Forces state: "Recommending an officer for the next rank... one level higher than his position calls for should be done as an encouragement, mostly in case of officers on combat duty..., flight commanders rated as Air Force pilots first class who have major achievements in military training, knowledge of new airplane technology, and discipline." There is no mention of any "sufficient" or "insufficient" flying time as a flight instructor. The letter of recommendation, by the way, did not say anything about Kostenko flying as an instructor. Where did this "insufficient" come from?

We can of course express our indignation, but we also need to understand something else: To a certain extent Colonel Kokoulin is in such a position himself that he has to look for more or less credible explanations for the rejections. Igor Mikhaylovich remembers quite well that recently several of the recommendations that he approved were sent back from "above." It goes without saying that all of them were signed "No action taken."

How can we explain all this? According to the personnel officer's opinion, the reason for all this lies in the military cutbacks. This is the "picture": If officers are now promoted as an "encouragement," it will become rather difficult to find positions for their higher ranks later, in the reduced Armed Forces.

Major V. Pozdnyakov, an Air Force personnel officer of the Western Group of Forces, cited the following data: As early as December of last year 20 letters recommending flight commanders for ranks one step higher than their present positions call for were sent to the Air Force personnel administration. None of them were approved. The explanation of the denial was rather simple: "Due to organizational measures concerning reductions in USSR Armed Forces personnel..."

Which means that people were attracted by an incentive, but that incentive was hidden straightaway—for the time being.

And another thing: Is it Nikolay Kostenko's fault that he, a hard-working officer and a good pilot, and many others like him live in such times that they cannot be given their well-earned new ranks?

[Signed] Captain I. Krotov, Western Group of Forces.

The editor asked Air Force Colonel General E.I. Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the Air Force and deputy minister of defense, to provide a commentary to this letter.

First of all I want to say that nobody in the USSR Ministry of Defense or the Air Force Main Command, or in the major air force commands, gave any orders not to recommend exceptional flight commanders for the next military rank one step higher than their present positions call for due to reductions in Armed Forces personnel.

Moreover, we understand how important it is to treat people with care and concern and to assess their work objectively. Therefore, we lately intensified our practice of encouraging such people. To date, for instance, we have recommended for promotion some 26 percent more flight commanders than in 1984-1985, and 42 percent more than last year.

Some of the recommendations, an average of a hundred a year, are really sent back or are denied by the commanders themselves. The reason for this are the candidates themselves, and not bias shown by the commanders of the military councils considering them. Some of the candidates fall below the level required of a flight commander in the position of a teacher of young pilots.

Promoting an officer to the next rank, one step higher than his position calls for, is one way to encourage flight commanders who excel in their duties. We cannot allow any unreasonable sameness of approach in this or any "old buddy" treatment. Sometimes, however, we learn about instances in which commanders want to look like "good old boys" to their subordinates and therefore unscrupulously recommend for promotion anyone who has served in his position for a certain period of time.

Our position in this respect is very well defined. The results of one's flying, combat, and tactical skills, and one's ability to teach the full program to his subordinates, rather than the period of service, should serve as the primary criterion. If the flight commander is not quite up to these standards, then we have to wait. But then his superiors, including the division commander, should talk to this pilot and explain to him why he cannot be recommended for promotion yet and suggest ways for improvement. I am sure that such a conversation, if it is conducted with good will and weighty reasons, would enhance the prestige of the commander and would provide a stimulus for the pilot in his combat training.

As for the situation described in this article, I requested that Air Force Lieutenant General Yu. Simakhin, head of the Air Force personnel administration, examine it in full detail. If any error has been committed he should immediately correct it. We are prepared to recommend to the USSR defense minister every flight commander who is worthy of being given the next rank one step higher.

I think that the newspaper did the right thing in raising this issue. It is commendable that KRASNAYA ZVEZDA is focusing specifically on problems of the social protection of our military. These problems are linked directly to the people's mood, to their attitude toward their duty, and that means they are linked to the combat preparedness of units and subunits.

Kryuchkov, Yazov Sign KGB Staffer's Obituary

PM1211155590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Nov 90 First Edition p 4

[Obituary of Lieutenant General V.S. Sergeyev]

[Excerpts] Lieutenant General Vasiliy Stepanovich Sergeyev, member of the [USSR KGB] Collegium, chief of a USSR KGB Main Directorate, honored state security staffer, and participant in the Great Patriotic War, died 9 November, aged 63, following a serious illness.

He devoted his entire adult life to selflessly serving the socialist fatherland and the cause of the Communist Party, of which he was a member for almost 40 years, having been a member of the USSR KGB party committee bureau in recent years. [passage omitted]

Since 1953, V.S. Sergeyev served in the state security organs. He worked for a long time at various posts within the USSR KGB Stavropol Kray Directorate. For a number of years he was chairman of the Kabardino-Balkar ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] KGB Directorate and chief of the USSR KGB Altay Kray Directorate. He held senior leadership posts within the USSR KGB central apparatus since 1983. [passage omitted]

[Signed] V.A. Kryuchkov, D.T. Yazov, G.Ye. Ageyev, F.D. Bobkov, V.F. Grushko, N.M. Galushko, A.A. Denisov, Ye.F. Ivanov, K.Ya. Kalinichenko, A.A. Kurkov, V.P. Pirozhkov, Yu.S. Plekhanov, V.A. Ponomarev, V.M. Prilukov, N.A. Savenkov, Yu.V. Storozhev, L.A. Shebarshin, N.I. Nazarov, V.M. Arkhipov, V.I. Varennikov, V.L. Govorov, V.F. Yermakov, K.A. Kochetov, P.G. Lushev, Yu.P. Maksimov, M.A. Moiseyev, I.M. Tretyak, V.M. Shabanov, Ye.I. Shaposhnikov, N.I. Shlyaga, V.M. Shuralev, N.V. Chekov, V.N. Chernavin, Yu.A. Yashin, A.V. Zhardetskiy, D.A. Lukin, P.F. Dubrovin. V.R. Yepifantsev, Yu.A. Kalganov, V.B. Kokovin, N.I. Ryzhak, V.Ya. Medvedev

Baltic Republics

Baltic States Council Leaders Meet 9 Nov

LD0911221190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2000 GMT 9 Nov 90

[ELTA-attributed report]

[Text] A Baltic States' Council meeting took place in Vilnius today. The Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian delegations were headed by Supreme Council chairmen Vytautas Landsbergis, Anatolijs Gorbunovs, and Arnold Ruutel.

The position of the Baltic states regarding the agreement on conventional arms reduction in Europe, slated for signing during the Paris conference, was discussed at the meeting. The participants expressed a unified [word indistinct] that this signing should contribute to the total restoration of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian states' independence. The removal of the Soviet occupational army from the territory of the Baltic states should be an integral part of arms reduction in Europe.

A statement was addressed to participant states of the Conferences on Conventional Disarmament in Europe and Security and Cooperation in Europe. The statement is to be published in the press.

The Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian state leaders exchanged information concerning the situation in their republics and coordinated internal and foreign policy activities.

Ryzhkov, Baltic Leaders Discuss Economic Ties

Prunskiene Arrives for Meeting

LD1011110590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Text] Kazimiera Prunskiene, prime minister of the Republic of Lithuania, arrived today in Moscow for negotiations with Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The negotiations will start at 1500 Moscow time. Economic and trade relations between the Republic of Lithuania and the Soviet Union in 1991 will be discussed. The premier is accompanied by Finance Minister Romualdas Sikorskis and Minister of Material Resources Romualdas Kozyrovicius.

Our aim, Kazimiera Prunskiene told an ELTA correspondent, is to start normal trade between two independent states without any diktat from the stronger side. We have prepared draft agreements. They take into consideration mutual possibilities and benefits. But the negotiations will not be easy because the Kremlin is aiming for a centralized management of the Soviet economy.

Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar and deputy chairman of the Latvian Council of Ministers [name indistinct] have arrived in Moscow for the same purpose.

Baltic Leaders Meet Before Talks

LD1011161890 Moscow TASS in English 1602 GMT 10 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandras Budris]

[Text] Moscow November 10 TASS—A conference of leaders of the three Baltic republics was held at the permanent mission of Lithuania in Moscow today. It was attended by Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene, Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar and Deputy Prime Minister of Latvia Arnis Kalnins.

Kazimiera Prunskiene told TASS after the end of the conference that its participants intend to meet today with Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov or Deputy Prime Minister Yuriy Maslyukov. They are going to discuss at this meeting the issues dealing with trade and economic relations between the Baltic republics and the Soviet Union in 1991.

According to Prunskiene, the Baltic leaders coordinated their stands and worked out a joint draft agreement on the future trade and economic relations with the Soviet Union according to the "three plus one" formula. The head of the Lithuanian government said that the document takes into account agreements, concluded already by Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia with other Union republics, including Russia, the largest of them. Prunskiene pointed out that this situation has been brought about, among other things, by the fact that "it is outside Russia's competence to manage all its resources", contrary to the statements of its leaders.

The Baltic leaders intend to state at the meeting that their republics will not take part in the federal budget, Prunskiene continued. Bilateral financial claims, arising in this connection, should become the topic of future talks between each republic and Moscow.

TASS Reports Talks

LD1111181390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1650 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 11 Nov (TASS)—A meeting of members of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium with government leaders of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the Latvian SSR, and the Estonian SSR was held on Friday in the USSR Government, at which issues relating to the conclusion of drafts of the state plan and budget of the USSR and union republics for 1991 were discussed, says a report distributed here today.

Taking acount of the specific features of the coming year as the initial stage in implementing the basic guidelines for stabilizing the national economy and the transition to a market economy, approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet, in shaping a single all-union market, and in strengthening the economic sovereignty of the republics, the need for coordinated activity and the involvement of the republics in the implementation of these tasks was stressed at the meeting.

Members of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium noted that prior to the conclusion of a new Union treaty, the interaction of the center and the republics should be based on the laws of the USSR, decrees by the USSR president, and resolutions of the USSR Council of Ministers. The shaping of union, republican, and local budgets on the principles and tenets of the USSR law on taxes on enterprises, associations, and organizations is of particular significance. It is also important to do one's utmost to preserve and develop economic relations between enterprises and regions of the country, and to insure the fulfilment of the state order and contractual undertakings for the delivery of production. The coordination of actions between the republics in conducting an integrated currency policy and in the sphere of price formation, mainly for basic food products and non-food products, is necessary.

However, Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimera Prunskiene and Estonian Government Chairman Edgar Savisaar, who spoke at the meeting, adopted a negative stance on practically all these issues. They reduced the whole complex of economic, currency, and budget-financial relations merely to trade exchange or, to use their expression "a commercial deal". Here, All-Union normative acts regulating the country's economic life were ignored.

The members of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium present at the meeting recommended the representatives of these republics, in the interest of the stable development of their economies in 1991, to take part in the work of the union-republican currency committee [soyuzno-respublikanskiy valyutnyy komitet], which should coordinate the actions of all union republics in the shaping and rational allocation of currency resources.

Despite the evident economic expediency, the leaders of the Lithuanian SSR Government avoided taking part in the meeting of the union-republican currency committee held today, at which, in particular, issues of upcoming purchases of raw matereials and materials for light industry, medicines, and some kinds of food and consumer goods from abroad were discussed. It goes without saying that this cannot fail to threaten the operation of many enterprises of light industry and of the agro-industrial complex in the Lithuanian SSR. Such an approach is unconstructive, first and foremost from the viewpoint of the normal functioning of the economy, and in resolving the republic's social problems.

Summing up the discussions, Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, expressed the hope that in completing the shaping of the plan and budget for 1991, good sense will prevail, and that mutually acceptable decisions will be found with the Baltic Republics.

Landsbergis Says USSR Wants 'Conflict'

LD1111150190 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandras Budrys]

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS—"The Soviet leadership is forcing a conflict in relations with Lithuania, evidently not willing to begin talks," Lithuanian parliament president Vytautas Landsbergis told TASS.

Commenting on the results of a Saturday meeting between Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and leaders of the Baltic republics, Landsbergis said he doubted that talks between the Soviet Union and Lithuania would begin at the end of November, as the sides had agreed before.

Landsbergis said the Soviet side was "accumulating accusations" against the republic, which proclaimed its independence on March 11. He noted that "in spite of humiliation, provocations and inadequate behaviour on the Soviet side, Lithuanian representatives are doing everything possible not to let the preparations for talks to be interrupted."

Speaking of the forthcoming European summit in Paris, Landsbergis said it will be attended by Lithuanian representatives. The Lithuanian leader did not mention their status, noting that the republic "is part of the all-European process and, in one way or another, is taking part in conferences," discussing affairs on the continent.

Asked if the announced introductions of Lithuanian passports will make it impossible for their owners to visit other countries, Landsbergis said "the corresponding law does not ban the use of Soviet passports and visas by Lithuanian citizens." He said the order will remain until Lithuania's independence is recognised by Moscow.

Landsbergis is in Moscow on his way to London, where he is heading on an "unofficial visit." He is planning to meet leaders of British political forces, parliament members and ethnic Lithuanians residing in Britain. Landsbergis said a meeting with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher had also been arranged.

Godmanis Calls Talks 'Difficult'

LD1211115590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1012 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga, 12 Nov (TASS)—Latvian Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis called the talks held in Moscow on Saturday between the government leaders of the three Baltic republics and the USSR Government "difficult." The prime minister himself did not take part in the meeting because of illness. Latvia was represented by his deputy Arnis Kalnins and Minister for Economics Janis Aboltins.

Late on the evening of 11 November, in a telephone interview on local television, Ivars Godmanis asserted that at the meeting with Nikolay Ryzhkov "all the Baltic republics were in effect given an ultimatum:" To abandon their taxation system, pricing policy, independent currency, and the formation of foreign economic relations. Only when this condition has been met "can" the Baltic republics "be included in the single state economic planning system of the USSR for 1991," he claimed.

Expressing his personal stance, the prime minister stressed that Latvia "will stand firm, together with Estonia and Lithuania, and will not give way in the face of this ultimatum." "We will continue our road to independence," he said, "regardless of what economic sanctions might ensue from the center."

The prime minister reported that the decision, for which Moscow has allocated one week, will be made by the republic's Supreme Soviet, but according to Godmanis the Latvian Government "will not give way in the face of an economic diktat."

As has been reported, at Saturday's meeting the leaders of the USSR Council of Ministers noted that until a new Union treaty has been concluded, relations between the center and the republics must be constructed on the basis of the laws of the USSR, the decrees of the USSR president, and the resolutions of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Kazimiera Prunskiene, prime minister of Lithuania, and Edgar Savisaar, chairman of the Estonian Government, who were next to speak, adopted a negative stance on almost all the issues. However, Nikolay Ryzhkov expressed the hope that once the plan and budget for 1991 were formed, "common sense will prevail and mutually acceptable solutions will be found with the Baltic republics."

Prunskiene Briefs Government on Talks

LD1211172390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1600 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Excerpts] A joint meeting of the Supreme Council Presidium and the government took place today. Sittings of commissions were also held. [passage omitted]

Kazimiera Prunskiene briefed the members of the government about the outcome of the 10 November meeting in Moscow.

As known, the talks between the Lithuanian delegation and N. Ryzhkov, Y. Maslyukov, and representatives of the all-Union departments ended in conflict. The Prime minister regards this as a disruption of a normal dialogue because the center was putting forward categorical demands, forcing execution of the economic laws of the Soviet Union, and through hard currency relations forcing Lithuania to remain part of the Soviet Union.

We suggested economic and trade relations, K. Prunskiene said. However, absolutely different conditions were set for us: if we renounce the status of a Union republic, then any trade agreements will be out of the question.

The prime minister thinks that the republic once again has found itself at the threshold it was last summer.

Prunskiene Comments

LD1211235990 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Report by correspondent Darius on a news conference by Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene in Vilnius on 12 November]

[Text] In her introductory speech Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene said that a meeting has been held at the Lithuanian mission by the delegations from the Baltic republics and a joint draft of intergovernment agreement was set up concerning joint economic links with the Soviet Union.

The document foresees that economic and trade relations will be carried out on a bilateral basis enjoying equal rights: specifically how much the Republic of Lithuania will sell to the Soviet Union, and how much the Soviet Union will sell to Lithuania. Apart from this, there was a reminder that these agreements do not violate the agreements with the republics of the Soviet Union.

These drafts were not new to the other side, K. Prunskiene said, because Lithuanian representatives and specialists have been working in Moscow for several weeks, and these agreements had been coordinated with the heads of departments of the Soviet Union. However, Nikolay Ryzhkov, prime minister of the country, declared at the meeting that intergovernmental agreement within one state is impossible and presented his conditions: The republics must recognize the laws of the USSR with regard to taxation and budget and give an accounting of hard currency. According to the regulations adopted in the Soviet Union for the next year the budget deductions do not differ considerably from the previous ones. According to the president's decree 40 percent of the republic's hard curency funds would be alloted for the repayment of the Soviet Union's debts; another 30 percent would be distributed through centralized channels.

It is absolutely clear, the Lithuanian prime minister said, that these are categorical demands, because we would become one of the 15 Soviet republics both legally and in practical terms. We had to remind them of our position as well as the meeting of the delegations at the beginning of October during which an agreement was reached on further bilateral economic relations.

Kazimiera Prunskiene stressed that the claims of the Soviet Union concerning hard currency are absolutely unfounded. Lithuania cannot repay the debts of a foreign country. There can be talk only of credits that Lithuanian enterprises have received, and the issue of repaying the credits to foreign states should be solved individually.

It unexpectedly turned out at the meeting that by President Gorbachev's decree the law on Lithuania's economic independence has been suspended until 1 July next year. The same laws have not been suspended for Latvia and Estonia.

After the Lithuanian and Estonian delegations left, the Latvians, basing themselves on this law of economic independence, made an attempt to come to an agreement with the Soviet Union's side.

However, yesterday Latvian Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis said in a telephone call that he supports the Lithuanian position.

So, the question arises, the prime minister said, has the Soviet Union decided to break off economic and trade links with the Republic of Lithuania and maybe with Estonia and Latvia, or are these indirect threats of economic blockade? Is the Soviet Union going to assume responsibility for its consumers while forbidding Lithuania to cooperate with other republics and cities? Is it going to take responsibility for its consumers who first of all will not receive food products from Lithuania? What is the point of further consultations concerning negotiations, because it is difficult to imagine that the same Nikolay Ryzhkov could have two stances, one as the prime minister of the Soviet Union and the other as the head of the negotiation delegation?

The talks in Moscow ended when K. Prunskiene said that questions raised by the other side can be only the object of negotiations while the delegations of the Baltic governments came to reach an agreement on trade relations.

K. Prunskiene said at the news conference that today the Soviet Government proposed by telephone that a joint working group of negotiation delegations meet this week. However, the prime minister said that if their position does not change this would be pointless.

Asked what should be done if the Soviet Union reinstates an economic blockade, the Lithuanian prime minister said that she has already proposed to open Lithuanian borders without delay and to address ourselves to specific partners that are interested more in trade than in political pressures and ultimatums. If the Soviet Union is not prepared to trade with us, how can it then explain that at the same time it does not allow us to have trade links with partners from other states? I do not believe, the Lithuanian prime minister said, that Saturday's [10 November] decisions are final and that there are no ways of returning to the market of the Soviet Union. We are going to talk to Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet, and maintain as many links with the Russian Federation as possible, K. Prunskiene said at the end of her news conference.

Resignation Call to Estonian Government Debated

PM1311101590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
11 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Leonid Levitskiy under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Crisis of Life—Crisis of Authority"]

[Text] Tallinn—A keen discussion has begun at the latest session of the Estonian Supreme Soviet. The question of the government's resignation has been raised there.

For almost 4 hours, legislators heatedly debated the fate of the present government and the need for Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar to resign. The fuelling of passions in the legislature was due to a statement published the day before by eight well known Estonian public figures representing various political forces. The authors include J. Allik, member of the independent Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, T. Kelam, leader of the national independence party, I. Toome, leader of the "Vaba Eesti" association, S. Kallas, chairman of the Estonian trade unions Central Council, and other figures popular in the republic.

"The participants in the meeting are aware of the need to stop the ever-deepening sociopolitical and economic crisis in Estonia, restore a secure equilibrium in society, and find a solution to settle the worsening crisis of authority," the statement stresses.

In the authors' opinion, the only possibility for society is to form a government of national unity. Such a government can be formed today only on the basis of all Estonia's progressive forces. It must also include authoritative representatives of the Russophone population.

The participants in the meeting, which adopted the statement "Path to the Settlement of the Crisis," asked trade union leader Siim Kallas to open consultations on the possibility of creating a national unity government as soon as possible.

Many deputies fervently supported the authors of the statement. In their words, in the past five months the Edgar Savisaar cabinet has dispelled all the fond illusions surrounding it. The government's actions have deepened the tension in the republic. The prime minister has been sharply criticized for a reluctance to "listen to others" and for selecting a team on the basis of membership of the National Front rather than competence.

It goes without saying that not all the speakers agreed that the government should resign. There were also those who wanted to give the discussion an anticommunist slant.

The discussion did not achieve reconciliation between the sides. The debates in parliament have spilled over into society and the mass media. On 9 November the National Front published a statement in support of Edgar Savisaar.

The head of the government has also reacted sharply to events. At a news conference, E. Savisaar said that he does not think it necessary to comment on an incident in which "eight private individuals get together and empower one person to form a new government." In his opinion, the authors of the statement represent organizations whose social base is constantly diminishing.

Latvians Decline Reform Meeting Invitation

LD0911160190 Riga International Service in Latvian 1830 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Text] The Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia today sent a reply to the USSR president's invitation for Latvian representatives to take part in working out a plan for economic reform. It is envisaged that this will be resolved by a special commission at the USSR Supreme Soviet Federation Council. As we already reported, the answer is negative. The Supreme Council believes that the presence of Latvian representatives is not necessary. Yesterday in a television interview Mavriks Vulfsons, leader of the Supreme Council Foreign Affairs Commission, expressed his dissatisfaction with this resolution. He said that this question should be left to the government to decide, and that an observer at the place where such fundamental problems are being tackled would be beneficial for Latvia.

Lithuania To Issue Coinage, Paper Currency

LD1211195590 Moscow TASS in English 1922 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 12 TASS—The Lithuanian Government has instructed the republican Finance Ministry to set up a mint and organise the production of coins, the IZVESTIYA newspaper reports today.

The new Lithuanian coins will be of small and large denominations. The small denomination coins will sport the republican state emblem—Vytis, a horseman with a sword, and a coin value. The large denomination coins will bear images of Lithuanian grand dukes and kings. The coins are expected to be called cents.

The republic is also preparing to issue its own paper money—Lits. Lits were introduced in Lithuania in 1922 and were considered hard currency. The new Lits will sport vytis, the inscription "Lietuvos Bankas" (Lithuanian bank), nominal value and a year. Lithuania is expected to issue banknotes worth one, two, five, ten, 25, 50 and 100 lits.

Lithuania Recognizes Moldovan 'Integrity'

LD0911222690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2000 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Text] In response to 26 October appeal by the Moldovan Supreme Council to the world's nations and legislature, the republic's legislature approved a statement which notes that the Soviet Union's continued policy to fracture Moldova is unacceptable. The Republic of Lithuania, notes the statement, recognizes the integrity of Moldovan territory as it existed on 23 June 1990 when the Moldovan Soviet Socialist Republic adopted the sovereignty declaration, and the republic enters into solidarity with the Moldovan nation's struggle for independence, freedom, democracy, and progress.

Lithuanian Groups Declare Opposition to Government

LD1011104490 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Text] A group of forces, regarded as right-wing, have published a statement declaring themselves in opposition to the existing government of Lithuania.

Lithuania must be prepared for a government crisis—that is why we are forced to prepare for the establishment of a new ministers' cabinet, as is customary in democatic countries—notes the party and movement declaration published in the state newspaper LIETUVOS. This is a joint statement by Democrats, Christian Democrats, the Lithuanian Green and Independence Parties, the Nationalist, Workers, Political Prisoners, and Deportees Associations, and the Lithuanian Liberty League.

It accuses the government of inactivity, noting that its apparatus is comprised of the former regime's nomenklatura members, that the implementation of the Sajudis economic reform concept has not even been begun, and that corruption and a shadow economy are flourishing in Lithuania.

According to the assertion by those parties and movements who are among the statement's signatories, the government's activity in diminishing the Lithuanian economy's dependence on the Soviet Union is unsatisfactory; in addition the government is not concerned with the implementation of newly-adopted laws and is ignoring its critics.

This statement was supported at a meeting held outside the Supreme Council building. It was held this evening by the Lithuanian Liberty League and was attended by nearly one thousand participants.

Some speakers voiced, either directly or indirectly, encouragement to take action against the occupation army.

Left-Wing Groups Respond

LD1011105190 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Text] Left-wing groups offered an immediate response today to the statement by right-wing parties and movements. In their opinion exhortations to form a new government even further destabilize and [word indistinct] intensify Lithuania's political and economic situation, which is already intricate, and they complicate the course of negotiations with the Soviet Union.

The assertion by Lithuanian Communist Party, the Agricultural Workers' Association, the Lithuanian Future Forum, and the Lithuanian Youth Forum states that blaming only the Lithuanian Government for everything is nothing but a devaluation of the 11 March national self-determination, a failure to grasp the actual situation, and a conscious misleading of the Lithuanian people.

At the same time it is pointed out that the government's activity merits criticism and is far from being above reproach. A categorical opposition is, however, expressed against generalized evaluations and attempts to set the government and the legislature against one another.

The statement by leftist forces notes that during this difficult time for Lithuania, civil harmony and unity are needed by everyone.

Resignation Said 'Unfounded'

LD1211143690 Moscow TASS in English 1421 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius November 12 TASS—"Rumours and speculations about the resignation of the Kazimiera Prunskiene government are unfounded," Ceslovas Jursenas, official spokesman for the Lithuanian Government, stated today. "It is all a lie," he told TASS.

A number of Lithuanian political parties and movements recently issued a joint statement demanding the government's resignation. This gave rise to rumours among the republic's population.

At the same time the government spokesman pointed out that "pressure on the government from some parties and movements has increased recently. The Lithuanian Freedom League has taken an extremely negative stand on the issue".

Today the republican government met for a regular session to discuss economic issues, the spokesman said.

"I do not think that the formation of a new government cabinet is the only right way to solve all the problems in Lithuania. I doubt that such a step would make sense now," Deputy Prime Minister Romualdas Ozolas emphasised during a republican television appearance on Sunday.

Ozolas Responds to Critics

LD1111034390 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Report by correspondent Roma Pakieniene]

[Text] The Lithuanian Government Information Service today disseminated a statement by Deputy Prime Minister Romualdas Ozolas. He responds in it to accusations by the Lithuanian Liberty League that Romualdas Ozolas has failed to carry out his promises concerning a principal renewal of the republic government.

As is known, having supposedly obtained such promises some time ago the Liberty League had suspended its hunger strike action outside the Government building. Several days ago, League activists resumed their hunger strike once again, however, this time they are outside the Supreme Council building.

Romualdas Ozolas stated that he had met with League representatives and had heard their requests in October. The government has complied with some of these requests. However, only the Supreme Council has the right to change government members, as was demanded by the League.

Romualdas Ozolas observed that the League's activists did not accept the forms of cooperation suggested by the government and he referred to their actions as destructive.

Lithuanian Liberty League's actions were not supported by our compatriot from the United States, artist Vytautas Jonynas currently visiting in Lithuania. In an interview with the newspaper RESPUBLIKA, he declared that these individuals' convictions fail to recognize tolerance of another individual. According to Vytautas Jonynas, the Lithuanian Liberty League seeks to lead a Catholic nation with non-Catholic methods. They have been so ruined by the system that they nearly resemble terrorists and dictators, asserted the artist.

In response to a question regarding the work of the legislators, he evaluated some of them as not liking democracy. The interlocutor did not identify specific names or facts.

Independence Euphoria 'Giving Way'

LD1111171590 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] Vilnius November 11 TASS—Six months after the declaration of independence by the Lithuanian parliament, the euphoria in Vilnius is gradually giving way to thoughts about how to put this idea into practice.

Consultations of Lithuanian and other Baltic leaders with union and foreign statesmen revealed how difficult the task will be.

"More than half a year has passed, but the promised recognition of independence is yet to come," the RESPUBLIKA newspaper wrote. "What to do next? In the first place, it is necessary to change the character of our policy. Endless improvisations should be replaced by a consistent political line".

The RIMATASIS KRASTAS (NATIVE LAND) weekly published an interview with Prime Ministe Kazimera Prunskiene, entitled "Non-Existent Power". At the end of the interview she admitted sadly: "Had I known what was in store for me, I do not think that either myself, or Brazauskas, or Ozolas would have agreed to take up this job.

"We never thought that the government would be a semblance of a government, that the parliament would believe it was all-powerful both in the legislative and executive spheres...We became almost a sham, but we cannot tender our resignations, because talks with Moscow will soon begin".

While opponents of Lithuania's withdrawal from the Soviet Union accuse the Prunskiene government of nationalism, anti-Sovietism and counterrevolutionary feelings, a group of members of the Lithuanian Freedom League are continuing a hunger strike in front of the parliament building. They demand the resignation of the government, which they consider "communist".

A group of political parties and public movements published an article in the government newspaper LIETUVOS AIDAS, calling for a new government. A week later Vladimir Berezov, secretary of the Independent Communist Party of Lithuania, and leaders of the Landowners' Union, the Forum of the Future of Lithuania and the Youth Forum strongly criticised these demands in the TIESA newspaper.

They believe that "such appeals further destabilise and artificially aggravate the already complicated political situation in Lithuania and make more difficult the talks with the Soviet Union. When the government is held responsible for the orgy of corruption in the republic, and especially for not lessening Lithuania's dependence on the USSR, this means the devaluation of the extremely important March 11 resolution, failure to understand the real situation and a deliberate deception of the Lithuanian population.

"The government's performance can be criticised, it is not faultless. However, we categorically oppose generalisations and attempts to set the government and the parliament against each other".

Pro-CPSU Lithuanian Communists Assail Leaders

LD1211214290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] The sociopolitical situation in Lithuania has deteriorated sharply in connection with the stepping up of actions of antisocialist forces agaisnt the Communist Party, the Soviet Army, and democratic organizations of the republic's working people. Such an opinion was to be heard today at an expanded session of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee (CPSU) Secretariat. In conditions of a deepening of the economic crisis and of a drastic fall in the standard of living of the population, the current leadership of Lithuania is more and more openly implanting a totalitarian dictatorship. The secretariat noted that it is turning the state mass media into an instrument for lies and slander against the CPSU and the USSR. The aim of such actions is extremly clear, Burokevicius, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU), stressed in his speech. They are directed first and foremost at wrecking the talks between Lithuania and the USSR and at compromising the USSR Armed Forces located on republic territory.

A resolution adopted at the session says, in part: The Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee Secretariat considers that the growth of discontent of the working masses with the antipeople policy of the Supreme Soviet and government of the republic requires that all party organizations reinforce organizational and ideological work among the population in order to impart a purposeful character to the growth of its political activeness. Communists should act as the promoters of unity and cohesion of all strata of working people, for joint action in defending democracy and of the socialist choice, and against the totalitarian aspirations of reactionary, nationalistic forces. Communists must give all-round assistance to the formation of a front of all democratic organizations and movements of Lithuania to implement the vital interests of working people and to overcome the crisis situation.

Condemn 'Quasifascist Forces'

PM1211165790 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 13 Nov 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by TASS correspondent S. Bykhun from the "Political Crossroads" column: "Statement by Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee Bureau"]

[Text] Vilnius, 12 Nov—The Lithuanian public is seriously concerned at the fact that threats, blackmail, and even physical violence have become more frequent recently against citizens who do not support the new Lithuanian leadership's policy aimed at curtailing democracy, infringing civil rights, and taking away working people's social protection.

In this connection, the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee Bureau has issued the following statement: "Separatist-nationalist circles who failed to prevent Lithuania's working people from celebrating the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Vilnius and other cities in the republic on 7 November have launched antistate activity. They not only destroyed the monument in Vilnius to Vincas Mickiavicius-Kapuskas, founder of the Lithuanian Communist Party, but on 8 November also published a provocative and slanderous Supreme Soviet statement on alleged abuses by Soviet troops in Lithuania. This incited Lithuanian nationalists to overt anti-Soviet steps. On 9 November 1990 there was a rally in Vilnius organized by the union of organizations like the Lithuanian Freedom League and 'Young Lithuania' under the slogan 'May the ground burn under the occupiers' feet.' The participants in this rally called for a 'holy war' against Communists, Soviet Army servicemen, and Russians.

"As the development of events in the republic shows, quasifascist forces have switched from words to actions. For example, on 9 November 1990 Vladislav Shved—member of the CPSU Central Committee, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, and chairman of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Citizens' Committee—who had been invited to a meeting with the public in the city of Taurage, was greeted near the rayon party committee building by a rampaging mob of Lithuanian nationalists summoned there by the leadership of the Sajudis regional leadership. With the total connivance of local law enforcement agencies, fists, bricks, and bottles were used against V. Shved, a candidate deputy of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. It was only through fortunate chance that a tragic outcome was avoided.

"The Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee Bureau declares its firm protest at the intensive fueling of anticommunist, anti-army, and anti-Russian feelings among the population's republic. Unfortunately, the Lithuanian leadership and its official organ—the newspaper LIETUVOS AJDAS (ECHO OF LITHUANIA) are actively participating in this campaign. The Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau demands that the republic's official authorities give a principled assessment of the events taking place in Lithuania and institute criminal proceedings against those guilty of inciting interethnic strife and violating decrees of the USSR President."

Soviet Troops Unjustly Blamed for 'Hooligans' Acts

PM1211142990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent Captain 2d Rank V. Gromak under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Whom Do Assault Troops Haunt?"]

[Text] Vilnius—At its latest sitting, the second session of the Lithianian Supreme Soviet discussed the question of the events of 7 November this year in Vilnius. The republic's minister of internal affairs and the general director of the Regional Security Department [department po okhrane kraya], briefed deputies on this. The Supreme Council adopted a statement "On Arbitrary Rule by USSR Occupation Troops in Lithuania" signed by V. Landsbergis. It says, in particular: "Despite protests lodged by the Supreme Soviet and the Lithuanian Government, units of the USSR occupation troops stationed in Lithuania organized a military parade on 7 November. This show of military force was accompanied by violent actions directed against citizens of the Lithuanian Republic. When assault troops attempted to forcibly occupy the Lithuanian Conservatory building, where classes were being held, not only was this higher educational establishment's autonomy violated but Lithuanian citizens also sustained serious injury, and property belonging to the educational establishment was destroyed. Clashes were provoked and material damage incurred in other parts of the capital. It was only due to people's self-possession and discipline that the occupation troops did not succeed in provoking serious incidents...."

To be frank, I would have been very surprised if the holiday in Vilnius had not elicited any statements from the local legislature. This newspaper has already said that Landsbergis made a speech on Lithuanian Radio 6 November in which he voiced the opinion that the military parade in the Lithuanian capital was being held not only to "demonstrate weapons" but above all to "show who is boss here, to intimidate the Lithuanian people, and possibly even to provoke a clash or conflict." Think about the last phrase. Was the chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, by means of this statement, not sanctioning the actions taken by those louts who intended to wreck the parade? Did he not provide a clear hint: If something happens, it will be the military who are to blame....

During the parade, thugs from the notorious "Lithuanian Freedom League," roused by their spiritual mentor's extremely transparent statement, threw bottles and chairs from the Conservatory windows onto the passing unit.... Certain publications have reported that internal troops had to be used to restore order....

However, this report was wrong.

"Internal troops did not take part in this incident," I was told by division commander Major General A. Zhitnikov. "No one burst into the Conservatory. We have spoken with the Conservatory's rector. He said that students did not take part in the hooligan actions. It emerged that they were thugs from Kaunas armed with chains and canisters of tear gas, and they even had a gas-operated spray gun. When they tried to prevent the convoys' passing, they were simply cordoned off in the Conservatory. There were no internal troops in the Conservatory building...."

I was also told that servicemen were constantly surrounded by animated young people carrying movie and video cameras awaiting provocations. Does that not prove the actions were carefully planned well in advance?

Now a word about the "serious injuries" mentioned in the statement. VECHERNIYE NOVOSTI wrote the following 8 November: "The disturbances in the republic's capital began at 1030 hours on Gedemi Boulevard. But a conflict flared up near the Conservatory between servicemen (the unit's number is still unknown) and local residents. The latter suffered injury. Regional Security Department staffers B. Zilanas, J. Girdjanis, and A Duboka suffered injury, along with concrete worker S. Guscjus from Construction Directorate No. 17. They were given emergency aid at the First Clinical Hospital's casualty ward and then sent home...."

There you go. The hooligans who violated public order have been suppressed, yet assault troops are once again the culprits. Moreover, the Supreme Soviet hyped this issue up the next day. Allow me to say, gentlemen, that this is nothing new. It is very reminiscent of the hubbub over the spring events in the psychiatric hospital and the incident at the Central Committee printing press.... Then too assault troops, who were nowhere near the place, were blamed for everything. Thus, everything indicates that some people just desperately need another upsurge of anti-Army sentiments.

RSFSR

Yeltsin Briefs Legislature on Gorbachev Talks

LD1311095490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0920 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow, 13 Nov (TASS)—Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, has announced that he proposed to USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev "a completely new system of state power—the formation of a coalition government of national unity, where several posts would be proposed by the Russian Supreme Soviet."

Boris Yeltsin spoke today at a session of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, where he reported on his 11 November meeting with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, which lasted many hours. According to Boris Yeltsin, there was discussion of the drawing up of a new union treaty and the division of functions between the center and the Russian Federation.

In the words of the head of the Russian legislature, "We are not laying claim to much, but have put forward our desire for three posts—head of government and ministers of defense and finance." This proposal has been supported, in principle, as an idea for the formation of a coalition government.

Boris Yeltsin noted that the president and he also spoke about the problems of the Russian-speaking population in other union republics, about matters of foreign policy and Russia's participation in its formation, and about financial problems. Fundamental agreement was reached on many issues. This was the case, specifically, with the setting up of a Russian television and radio company. The problems of the Crimea and its population were also broached.

Boris Yeltsin appealed to deputies "not to mislead people by saying that the '500days' program has already begun." "There is no Russian '500 days' program," he declared. "We approved this program as a union program, believing that the center would have to adopt a certain number of laws, after which Russian laws would follow, and then it would be necessary to begin implementing the program," he said.

'Strong' Union With USSR Favored

LD1211151190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1355 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS legislative correspondents]

[Text] Moscow, 12 Nov (TASS)—"We are in favor of a Union treaty, and a strong Union with the USSR," Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, said today. He briefed the members of Russia's Constitutional Commission, which is in session today, on his meeting yesterday with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and the head of the Soviet Government Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Refuting several speculative publications alleging that Russia is "breaking up" the Union, Boris Yeltsin told the members of the constitutional commission that he had assured the USSR president that "in this regard the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] leadership has a firm position."

"We are definitely in favor of the Union," Boris Yeltsin stressed.

According to the head of the Russian legislature, during yesterday's meeting with the USSR leadership there was discussion on the division of functions and the new Union treaty. He noted that this was one of many topics discussed during the meeting. After a business-like discussion, which took place "without heightened tones," it was decided to implement both processes in parallel. To this end a decision was made to create commissions of the governments of the USSR and the Russian Federation to carry out preparatory work in all spheres. Among these, Boris Yeltsin cited the division of property and functions; the problems of raw material resources, including oil, gas, gold, and other precious metals; and the problems of operating the banking system.

These commissions, according to the head of the Russian legislature, should draft proposals so that they can "in effect be approved before the union treaty is concluded." In this event, the document on the division of functions will provide a basis for concluding the Union treaty, Boris Yeltsin stressed.

Silayev Meets With Defense Industry Managers

LD1211112190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] After a short break, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet session has resumed work. Our correspondent Andrey Nikiforov is in the House of Russian Soviets:

Good day. Probably the main event here today is the plenary sitting of the constitutional commission. Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin is chairing the sitting. [passage omitted]

The RSFSR Council of Ministers is at present holding a major conference with the managers of republic enterprises under Union jurisdiction. These are mainly managers of the military industrial complex. They are discussing interaction and mutual assistance in the changing economic conditions. There are many problems here, but in particular, in light of the sharp cut in defense expenditure enterprises will have difficulties with production and employment. Besides this, the territories also expect help in their development from enterprises.

Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers, and Yuriy Vladimirovich Skokov, his first deputy, have addressed the enterprise managers. The enterprise managers themselves are now responding. The discussion is continuing.

Silayev Interviewed on Meeting

LD1211212490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Interview with Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, by correspondent O. Bobin in Moscow on 12 November; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Bobin] The Army and the transition to the market economy—that was the subject of the two previous meetings here. Today the problem of the defense enterprises, which is connected with it, was discussed. As speakers pointed out, the fresh wind of change which has been promised in conversion has not affected many factories. It cannot be denied that large-scale defense does not switch easily to market relations. The majority of enterprises are situated on the territory of the republic, and many social problems linked with the difficult economic situation in the industry have been tackled in Russia's towns. It was noted in the speeches that a law on conversion needs to be adopted as quickly as possible.

Ivan Stepanovich, are you in mutual understanding with the military-industrial complex, 70 percent of which is subordinate to the entire USSR but is situated on Russian territory?

[Silayev] If one speaks about the principle of mutual understanding, as a former worker of this complex, I understand them and I sense their problems. If one is speaking about today's meeting, then there are problems. On a number of fundamental issues we stand on the positions we have stated. But we have one way out, since this is a colossal complex with a colossal scientific-technical and economic potential, and we are living on one territory, and consequently we should work together with one another. Yesterday we had a very serious and responsible meeting at the highest level in which I took part, and it was precisely these issues which were examined. Of course, we are not in favor of confrontation, but we cannot waive the principles of economic sovereignty and the interests, including their interests. Then again, they are categorically right—order must be imposed. Labor discipline, discipline of commitments, and so forth—this is also being heard very acutely, and here they are, of course, right.

Silayev Comments on Problems

LD1211232990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Interview with Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, by correspondent Andrey Nikiforov in Moscow on 12 November—recorded]

[Text] [Nikiforov] Ivan Stepanovich, what tasks did the government of the Russian Federation set itself when it organized this important meeting with the leaders of these enterprises?

[Silayev] First and foremost, I would like to say that this is not the first meeting, and not an unexpected meeting, for we are holding a number of meetings with various, let's say, economic formations, territories, regions and representatives, and so, the next meeting in the series is that of the body of commanders of production, so to say, which, by the volume of production, make up something like 50-55 percent of the overall volume on Russia's territory, and somewhere in the region of 70 percent of the volume of production of defense equipment. In the final analysis, this is very interesting and powerful economic strength both in terms of its production possibilities, and its scientific potential. We are interested in how they are carrying out their conversion, how they feel about the principles of the movement towards the market, what questions they have to ask, and finally, we are trying to find the most effective forms of cooperation. They have many problems, not only purely production ones but, I would say even more so, social ones. And so, we are looking for ways to cooperate in the new economic conditions.

[Nikiforov] Ivan Stepanovich, as far as I can see, things are not progressing without complications. The leaders of the enterprises are interested in questions of ownership, whether their enterprises will be answerable to the union or the republic. They are worried about the reduction of state spending on defense and about the problems which face them as leaders of these enterprises as a result of this: the decline of production and social conditions and the lack of work for their employees. In connection with this, which major decisions is it important for you to reach as a result of this meeting?

[Silayev] Well, they are obviously very concerned, very worried about the question of to whom they are subordinate. All the same, we are not talking about transferring them from subordination to union departments, to subordination to some sort of republican departments, and incidentally, we do not have such departments. As is laid down in the new economic conditions, we are in favor of them being economically independent. We already have examples, very interesting ones, when associations organize themselves or other forms voluntarily organize themselves with the aim of implementing some sort of interests, including the interests of the national economy of Russia, and we will support this, we told them this today. We are not supporters of an administrative change of nameplates. Naturally, I would say that the defense people have more problems today than those engaged in purely civilian production, because for many years they had guaranteed orders and fairly high levels of capital investment and budget financing, and they developed quite a powerful infrastructure. Now all this is collapsing as a result of the sharp reduction in financing and in material provisioning.

This is directly linked to the social situation; people are not fully occupied, they are earning less, and at the same time I would say, there is a more professional aspect both from the point of view of the working class and from that of the leaders of industry. Therefore, it is important to find new forms, but at the same time, to preserve this potential, to utilize it to the utmost for civilian purposes without losing any of its potential.

Veterans Criticize Yeltsin Policies

LD1111104190 Moscow TASS in English 1013 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS—War and labour veterans from Smolensk region, central Russia, denounced Russian parliamentarians for splitting with central authorities on reform policy in a letter to Russian President Boris Yeltsin and the parliament's presidium, published in today's SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

The veterans warned of "the great danger of the current situation in the country."

"We need as air today the normalisation of the political and socio-economic situation, an atmosphere of civil peace and agreement," the letter said. [sentence as received]

In his speech in Russian parliament on October 16, Yeltsin aimed to break up the Soviet Union, rather than consolidate society, they said.

They denounced Yeltsin's idea of differentiating local councils by "their adherence to the Democratic Platform and the left-centre coalition" as undemocratic and harmful to consolidation efforts.

Official Denies Discussing Ties With Taiwan

LD1211122390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1025 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow, 12 Nov (TASS)—The government of the Russian Federation has not examined the matter of establishing political contacts with Taiwan on an official level. This was reported to the TASS correspondent today by a spokesman for the RSFSR [Russian Federation Socialist Republic] Foreign Ministry. He referred to an official statement from Russia's foreign policy department which, he said, is to be distributed here today in connection with reports that have recently appeared in the foreign press regarding the possibility of official relations being established between Russia and Taiwan.

At present, the Foreign Ministry spokesman added, a concept of the entire complex of relations between the RSFSR and the Asia-Pacific region as a whole is being developed by the republic's Foreign Ministry. The positive attitude of Russia's leadership to relations between the RSFSR and the PRC, which have been developing successfully of late, will be reflected in the statement.

Popov Delivers Report to Moscow Soviet Opening

LD1111182790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] A session of the Moscow Soviet opened today. A TASS correspondent reports: One should not wait for the leaders of the Union and Russia to sit down again at the negotiating table, but should straightway take urgent measures which will enable Moscow to start moving toward the market and will make the hard life of Muscovites somewhat easier. This is the essence of the minimum program which Moscow Soviet Chairman Popov proposed at the Moscow Soviet's second session which opened today. Delivering a report on the state of affairs in the city, the mayor commented that Moscow has become a unique symbol of the general crisis of perestroyka, with the command system no longer working and the new market mechanisms not yet created.

In the last few months there have been shortages of tobacco, bread, sugar, gasoline, and eggs in turn—essentially of all kinds of goods. The program proposed to the deputies develops many solutions from the previous session. It envisages specific measures to privatize housing and trade, create a free market, protect the population from the unpredictabilities of the market, further improve pre-school education, and create a taxation system. These measures, the rapporteur explained, fall fully within the competence of the Moscow Soviet, and they can be put into effect immediately.

Thus it is proposed that parents should pay 75 rubles for the education of each child. Privatization of housing will bring more than a few advantages to townsfolk; but introducing privatization into trade will, alas, most likely lead to price rises. A ration card system must therefore be introduced into the capital. The denationalization of the service sphere and of small-scale and medium-size industry subsequently planned will demand additional welfare measures in order to protect the population.

Touching upon the causes hampering the drawing up and adoption of a program for Moscow to transfer fully to market relations, the mayor cited first and foremost the differences of opinion between the Union and republican legislatures. The rapporteur severely criticized the president's program which, according to him, benefits only the center and is a program enabling the former apparatus to appropriate what was formerly state property.

Representatives of all factions expressed a desire to take part in the debate which followed the report. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU City Committee, speaking on the instructions of the Moskva group of deputies, paid primary attention to the program for Moscow's transition to market relations. He stressed that this document should bring about an enhanced standard of living for all Muscovites and not just entrepreneurs. The speaker described pushing ahead the process of privatization as a cavalier attack on state property and as an attempt to replace one form of property by another, without taking account of the possible profundity of social conflicts. This process must of necessity be carried out under the control of the working people and in their interests. Pointing out the inevitability of the transfer to the market, the leader of the capital's party organization declared that the program is in need of additional expert advise and serious revision. He noted that the CPSU City Committee intends to help by involving in this work prominent academics and specialists from various spheres of the national economy.

Calls for Popov Resignation Noted

LD1111224190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2030 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Report by correspondent N. Ivanov from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] A Moscow Soviet session opened today. It is believed that the decisions that may be adopted during this session will be epoch-making for the city's residents; for example, the privatization of all shops and a quadrupling of public transport fares.

[Begin recording] [Ivanov] The session opened with a report by Popov, chairman of the Moscow Soviet, on the situation in the capital. Representatives of various fractions spoke after him. Deputy Prokofyev from the Moscow group stressed that enforced privatization would be like enforced collectivization and suggested that a Red Guard style attack in introducing the market should be shunned. The number one sensation was the proposal by Deputy (Sergey Beloshev) that the Moscow Soviet chairman and his deputy resign.

[S.B. Stankevich, Moscow Soviet deputy chairman] Since an issue of this kind has been proposed for the agenda it will be put to a vote.

[Unidentified speaker] A chairman of the Moscow Soviet who neglects the Soviet, who speaks out against Soviet power, cannot be chairman of the Moscow Soviet.

[Ivanov] Many deputies expressed dissatisfaction with the participation of the Moscow Soviet leaders in several demonstrations at the same time on 7 November. According to Sergey Stankevich, the issue of granting Moscow residence permission to Polozkov, leader of the Russian Communist Party, will be decided by the appropriate commission of the Moscow Soviet. [end recording]

Kuzbass Workers Movement Registers Newspaper

PM1311112390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Viktor Kostyukovskiy report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Newspaper for the Kuzbass and for the Russia"]

[Text] Kemerovo—NASHA GAZETA, the publication of the Kuzbass workers' movement, will now be distributed not only in Kemerovo Oblast but in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] as well. It is registered with the RSFSR Ministry of the Press and Mass Media with the index number 51905 and will appear twice weekly. Its program goals and tasks are defined as follows: coverage of the problems of the growth and development of the workers' movement in the Kuzbass and other regions of the country, the publication of materials on the problems of the transition to the market in conditions of the joint enterprise zone, support for progressive movements whose activity is aimed at implementing the economic program of the Russian Government and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and the struggle against bureaucracy and the monopoly of individual parties and groupings in society's sociopolitical life.

People can now subscribe to NASHA GAZETA, which in a short period of time has managed to become popular in many Russian oblasts: "Soyuzpechat" has been informed of its inclusion in the catalog of newspapers and magazines of the RSFSR.

New Kamchatka Oblast Soviet Chairman Elected

PM0911091690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Nov 90 Union Edition p 3

[INTERFAX report: "Kamchatka Leadership Changes"]

[Text] Colonel of Military Counterintelligence Petr Premyak has been elected chairman of the Kamchatka Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies. On Premyak's own recommendation, Albert Usov, leader of the "Democratic Kamchatka" movement, has been elected his deputy.

Polozkov Permit Refusal Report Comparison

PM0911113390

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 November 1990 carries in its Moscow Evening Edition on page 2 a report by A. Illesh under the heading "I. Polozkov Refused Moscow Residence Permit—Moscow City Soviet Deputies Have Adopted This Decision." The IZVESTIYA report has been compared with the version carried in Moscow IZVESTIYA 7 November Union Edition published in the 7 Nov Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 73, and reveals the following variation:

Page 75, column two, last paragraph, last sentence reads: down by law."

But as is well known, there are no hopeless situations. According to information in the editorial office's possession, Comrade Polozkov could live at the dacha in Barvikha—a special settlement for high-ranking leaders. The paradox lies elsewhere. If you look at what has happened in the context of the development of democracy in the USSR, then without fear of making a big mistake it may be asserted that the leader of the Russian Communist Party has been lucky. Understandably, a few years ago the question of the registration of a Politburo member would naturally not have arisen at all. On the other hand, a few months ago—before the Constitutional Oversight Committee deemed invalid the procedure whereby prolonged residence without registration ended in personal familiarization with the precinct militiaman and subsequent expulsion by administrative means—unpleasantnesses could arise. Previously this practice was constantly encountered usually by strata of Moscow's population such as people of no fixed abode, prostitutes, and dissidents.

So that the democratic changes are to the advantage of us all. (adding passage)

Western Republics

Moldova Still in 'Shock' Over Dubossary Deaths

PM1211164390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by Eduard Kondratov under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Tension in Moldova Is Not Easing"]

[Text] Kishinev—The holidays in Moldova were not celebrated properly and passed like gloomy, ordinary days. The republic cannot get over the shock caused by the shooting in Dubossary.

The detachments of Moldovan volunteers have been dissolved, but reinforced voluntary militia details are mounting guard on the left bank of the Dnestr around the clock. Silent mistrust has become the dominant feeling in relations between the inhabitants of the Dnestr region and the SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of Moldova government organs. The people are insisting on guarantees of their security, and having lost their confidence in the Moldovan Militia are demanding that USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops be tasked with protecting the bridges.

Dubossary remains in turmoil. People are demanding that those who caused the loss of human life be punished. The city's women, having suspended their political hunger strike, have sent a delegation to Moscow for meetings with members of the country's government, the USSR MVD leadership, and the Committee of Soviet Women. The SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet legislative commission that is to establish all the circumstances of the bloody conflict, is painstakingly at work, as is a large group of investigators from the Prosecutor's Offices of the USSR, Moldova, and other republics.

Despite the relative calm in the past few days, the tension in the republic is not easing. Everyone knows that elections to the supreme organ of power of the republic that has been proclaimed here are scheduled for 25 November in the towns and villages on the left bank of the Dnestr and in Bendery. The very fact that preparations for them are continuing and candidates are being put forward is electrifying the sociopolitical atmosphere more and more. Let us remind readers that it was the beginning of similar elections in the south of the republic, inhabited by the Gagauz, that caused the present and steadily deteriorating crisis. Tiraspol resident A. Dyyachenko announced his resignation as USSR People's Deputy as a sign of his disagreement with this attempt to split Moldova and bring it to the brink of fratricidal civil war.

People in Moldova, who are yearning for peace and concord, are today hopefully awaiting some kind of reassuring news from the Conciliatory Commission of the legislature of Moldova headed by P. Luchinskiy, first secretary of its Communist Party Central Committee. Several meetings between representatives of the Moldavian parliament, the Gagauz, and Dnestr region residents from Tiraspol, Komrat, Bendery, and Parkany have already been held. The conversation about conditions for reconciliation is proceeding with great difficulty at present. An RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet delegation, headed by S. Krasavchenko, is continuing its meetings with the Russian-speaking population. It is studying the situation as well as the causes that pushed the population on the left bank of the Dnestr to express its unwillingness to live within the SSR of Moldova.

Saturday's discussion at the plenum of the Communist Party of Moldova Central Committee focused on what worries people most of all today, and the measures that could stop the processes that are destructive to society. Communists are well aware how important it is to stop the escalation of interethnic hostility and prevent a "Lebanonization" of Moldova. It was said at the plenum that the "brain drain"—meaning the outflow of scientific and technical cadres from the republic—has sharply swollen while cases of persecution of Communists and tyranny over raykoms [rayon party committees] are no longer isolated incidents. The declaration adopted by the plenum condemns violence as a method of resolving interethnic conflicts and poses the question of including guarantees to preserve Moldova's integrity in the text of the future Union treaty.

The fifth session of the republic's Supreme Soviet will continue on Monday. To a great extent, the stabilization of the situation depends on its decisions, although perhaps the stance of leaders of the Dnestr region and the Budzhak Steppe region will be equally important.

Correspondent Describes 2-Week Moldova Stay

LD1011054790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2200 GMT on 9 November in its "Television News Service" program carries a two-minute report by correspondent E. Dzafarov upon his return from a two-week stay in Moldova.

The video report shows street scenes, broken windshields, idling tractors, cameramen, small demonstrations; Dzhafarov says this does indeed raise many questions: "Will Moldova ever become united and sovereign, or will it become a federal republic or will it be altogether pulled apart by conflicts?" This question, Dzhafarov comments, will not be answered until every single person makes his position clear. He also asks a number of other questions such as "Why does the return of true national values require illegally-armed, 10,000-strong carabineer formations in the republican military guard? What is this: national rebirth or national chauvinism?"

Dzhafarov continues: "We did not have the faintest idea then what was going on around us. But around us passions were running high. A whole group of the central press was arrested by voluntary worker detachments. Attempts were made to overwhelm the press with conferences and tales to conceal the real situation. Nevertheless, thank God, we have made the acquaintance of Mircha Druk." Video shows news conference on cramped premises; date, place, participants not given.

A sharp, mostly indistinct exchange follows between Druk and correspondents in which the correspondents complain about the way they have been treated. To this Druk says: "By sensationalizing things one cannot resolve matters. We saw the way Central Television has been tackling our issues. How many claims have been made by the legislature, the government, the people and the public? Instead of helping us, what are you doing? Looking for underdogs?"

Moldova's Druk Interviewed on 'Vid' Program

LD1011220490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 9 November, in its "Vid", "View (Vzglyad) and Others" program, carries a 9-minute video report by an unidentified correspondent on the various factions in Moldova.

Andrey Buikly, chairman of Komrat town executive committee, and Konstantin Taushanzhi, rayon executive committee chairman in Komrat, give their views of the situation. Taushanzhi says: "The Moldovan and Gagauz peoples have never been at loggerheads. How did this happen? Clearly the reasons must be found. What we have seen over the last two or three weeks are the consequences. We must move away from consequences and get to the true reasons. We shall find the true reasons. The true reasons are to be found in the totalitarian state, the totalitarianism that sits inside us, in our slavery."

Giving the Dnestr Republic's side of the story, Vladimir Yemelyanov, chairman of the OSTK, United Council of Labor Collectives, of the town of Tiraspol says: "We shall not be brought to our knees. We shall go ahead with elections, and we shall defend our political rights. This will not suit the masters who are in power in Moldova today at all. I am not 100 percent certain that they will not send another punitive expedition here."

Vlad Dariyc, chairman of the Orkhey, Orgeyev, town soviet, then says: "If the eternal dream of the Russian tsars had come to pass and they had seized the Bosphorus and Dardanelles straits, they would have given their written language to the Greeks and said that they had given the Greek people access to a higher civilization, Russian civilization. This imperial policy was pursued in what I would call a very aggressive fashion. Very many of our Russian fellow citizens were not aware of it because it did not affect them. They perhaps even regarded it as right. Now that there is a reawakening of national self-awareness, people realize that if we are talking of a Union of sovereign states there can be no question of two state languages. There are sovereign republics, and there is a state language, and there is a federal language of communication between nationalities—the Russian language, voluntarily chosen by the republics, for contacts between respective entities."

A caption in English then says "Exclusive" and Moldovan Premier Mircha Druk begins: "How do I feel? I feel like a kamikaze pilot. One must make a deliberate choice to agree to be prime minister in present circumstances. One has to know. I did know. So I am not whining or complaining, because I knew what I was letting myself in for."

A voice-over says: "Mircha Druk, prime minister of Moldova. Linguist, psychologist, and economist. Supporter of the market and privatization. A good athlete. He still sees himself as an optimist."

The interview with Druk continues:

"[Correspondent] What choice will Moldova prefer in the future—to remain in the Union, or reunification with Romania following the German model?

"[Druk] Well, that is a question for the chiefs of the forecasting department, or for an astologer. I cannot forecast what choice wil be made. It is up to the people to make their choice. The residents of the republic must choose. But as for how events will proceed, I can say that we have formulated our own position on this and we have repeatedly declared it—it is important for Moldova to remain within the Union framework.

"[Correspondent] Very many see you as a fairly strong figure—not fairly strong, but simply a strong figure who will make it possible for Moldova to find a way out of its economic impasse. Others and it will be no secret to you who they are, call you simply Mirchas the Bloody.

"[Druk] Some people see me that way, do they? I must thank them. I am particularly interested in the bloody bit. I think they should hear this. I see myself as a peaceable person, a totally peaceable person. More peaceable than all of them put together. That is the way it is. I am a very peaceable person. I utterly reject all accusations against the republic and government that we are causing any offense to Russians, to Ukrainians, to the Gagauz, Jews, and so on. So I suggest and demand that there should definitely be a consulate-type mission from Russia, and that it should definitely register, and tackle using the means available in world practice, absolutely all the elements of conflict, even at the everyday level. You know when conflicts arise? A real conflict will arise when some government in some country, on some continent—Africa or Europe—comes forward and says: We recognize the Dnestr Moldovan Socialist Republic, and congratulatory messages come in for President Smirnov. That is when a conflict will arise." The interview ends.

Sergey Krasavchenko, a Russian people's deputy who has come on a peace mission to the republic, says in an interview that if the Moldovan leadership shows goodwill and if the regions demonstrate common sense, a solution may be found.

Moldovan Supreme Soviet Discusses Situation

LD1211142690 Moscow TASS in English 1357 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By MOLDOVA-PRESS—TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev November 12 TASS—Chairman of the parliamentary Reconciliation Commission Petr Luchinskiy today reported to the Moldavian Supreme Soviet on the commission's work during the past seven days.

He said the commission has had meetings with representatives of the Dnestr Area and the southern districts of Moldavia [Moldova], inhabited by the Gagauz population. As a result of talks with the Gagauz side, a moratorium was declared on the creation of state structures in the "Gagauz republic." The situation in the Dnestr area is also improving. Nevertheless, the commission was unable to pursuade people's deputies from the southern districts and the left-bank Dnestr area to return to the Moldavian parliament.

Luchinskiy advised the Supreme Soviet to reckon in its law-making activities with the specific features of every area of the republic and called for mutual trust in this work. He believes special attention should be given to settling economic problems.

A special parliamentary commission, consisting of representatives from the Moldavian Supreme Soviet, the Gagauz population and the left-bank Dnestr area, was formed to draw up concrete proposals for a compromise.

The session was addressed by Vice-Chairman of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet Viktor Pushkash. He informed parliament on the work done by a commission set up to supervise the fulfilment of parliament's decision to disband all volunteer detachments. He said such detachments had disbanded on the right bank of the Dnestr, including the southern areas of Moldavia. Their members have returned to their permanent places of residence. Workers' detachments still remain only in the left-bank Dnestr Area. They patrol the roads into Tiraspol and Bendery at night. There is a permanent control post in Dubossary, blocking the Poltava highway linking Moldavia with the Ukraine.

Premier Briefs Legislature

LD1211174890 Moscow TASS in English 1735 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Kishinev November 12 TASS—The Moldavian [Moldovan] parliament today resumed session amid social, political and economic tension in the republic.

Legislators are to discuss more than 40 bills, including bills on guarantees for the rights of ethnic minorities in Moldavia, on citizenship and referenda.

Petr Luchinsky, chairman of the parliamentary conciliation commission, set up recently to defuse the explosive situation, told the morning session that the results of the commission's work were "less than modest".

He submitted a number of proposals to find a compromise.

Legislators heard a report on the disbandment of volunteers' detachments and the confiscation of armaments. These detachments continue to operate in the cities of Bendery, Tiraspol, Rybnitsa and Dubossary, deputies said.

The parliament was told about the work by a parliamentary commission that investigated the November 2 events in Dubossary.

Prime Minister Mircha Druk told parliament about the government's plans. He said that his government would rely on its own plan of the transition to a market economy, rather than on that of the union government, in working out and implementing an economic reform programme.

Druk said the Union government's programme "does not reflect the republic's peculiarities. At the same time, the sovereignty declaration dictates a number of quite new conceptual approaches to the implementation of economic reform".

Session Shows 'Irreconcilability'

LD1211204190 Moscow TASS in English 2013 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondents Boris Zverev and Valeriy Demiditskiy]

[Text] Kishenev November 12 TASS—The Moldavian [Moldovan] parliament resumed work in Kishenev with deputies from two of the three conflicting parties absent.

The absentees included representatives of the Dnestr region and southern Moldova, which have proclaimed themselves the Dnestr and the Gagauz republics in response to the new republican leadership's nationality policy.

The Moldavian parliament proclaimed these decisions unconstitutional.

An attempt to solve the issue by force left three people dead and several others wounded in Dubossary on November 2. As a result, the leaders of the two breakaway regions are in no mood to compromise.

Their demands are very much alike: Both urge the immediate resignation of Prime Minister Mircha Druk and his cabinet and a search for political independence for the newly proclaimed republics.

Druk told parliament today that he views the harmonisation of inter-ethnic relations as a major aspect of his activity. He said that "the reliable defense of the interests of the indigenous nation, which gave the republic its name, as well as of other ethnic communities" residing on Moldavian territory was a high priority.

The parliament's opening session illustrated the irreconcilability of all sides. According to observers, the government is unlikely to risk another attempt to resolve the crisis by force.

Although all sides have declared themselves in favour of a compromise, the situation leaves little hope for this.

Session Continues 13 Nov

LD1311134790 Moscow TASS in English 1156 GMT 13 Nov 90

[By MOLDOVA-PRESS-TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev November 13 TASS—The Moldavian [Moldova] parliament continued discussing the situation in the republic today. Soviet People's Deputy Ion Drutse blamed the Moldavian parliament for the current tensions in the republic. The lawmakers went on summer vacation and lost valuable time, he said. The parliament did much in the cultural sphere and language revival, instead of concentrating on economic reforms, he said. The standoff wouldn't have happened if economic issues had been tackled squarely, he said.

"There is something wrong with the Moldavian People's Front, since it has turned from a democratic popular movement into a rigid, uncompromising, anti-democratic organisation," Drutse said. "Its idea to rename Moldavia The Romanian Republic of Moldavia is absurd, both linguistically and politically," he said.

"I have never been a member of the Soviet Communist Party. But you shouldn't identify the modern Communist Party of Moldavia with its former leader Boduyl. There are many healthy forces in the Moldavian Communist Party that can promote stabilisation on Moldavia," he said.

The speaker called on all progressive political forces in the republic to unite and seek a compromise. He then went on to suggest an appeal by the Moldavian parliament to the USSR Supreme Soviet. The document was approved by an overwhelming majority of deputies.

"Elections in the Dnestr region threaten both Moldavia and all of the Soviet Union. These unconstitutional actions wil provoke new violations of the Soviet and Moldavian constitutions and could start a civil war," the appeal says.

The parliament is discussing measures to stabilise the situation in the republic.

Moldovan Communists Hold Plenum, Discuss Crisis

Call Situation 'Complex'

LD1011162690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1508 GMT 10 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Fedor Angeliy]

[Text] Kishinev, 10 Nov—The situation in Moldova remains complex and explosive, and a rigid confrontation between the Moldovan and non-Moldovan part of its population is at hand. This appraisal of the situation which has emerged in the republic was given by participants in a plenum of the Moldova Communist Party Central Committee held here today.

Speakers, including Petr Luchinskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moldova Communist Party Central Committee, noted in particular that the integrity of the Republic of Moldova was threatened. The Communists named the unconsidered decisions of the republic government concerning issues of interethnic relations as one of the reasons for the emergence of the crisis.

With concern speakers drew attention to the trend of non- Moldovan scientists leaving the republic. In the course of only one week, three doctors of science left the Kishinev Polytechnical Institute, its rector Vasiliy Kalmutskiy said at the plenum. In his words, a real "brain drain" is under way. It was also pointed out that among representatives of the Moldova Supreme Soviet standing commissions there is not a single non-Moldovan deputy, and the government of the republic is monoethnic.

The plenum of the Moldova Communist Party Central Commtitee adopted a declaration in which attempts to resolve interethnic conflicts by force and to inflame anti-communist hysteria were subjected to condemnation. It is impossible to resolve interethnic conflicts by force. The document stresses that the attainment of civil peace and national accord is possible only by peaceful means and the joint efforts of all public forces and state structures.

Want Peaceful Solution

LD1111144590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1304 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By MOLDOVA-PRESS-TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev, 11 November (TASS)—The Moldova Communist Party [MCP] has from the very start of the complications in the situation in the republic directed its work at solving the problems that arise by means of a peaceful dialogue, Petr Luchinskiy, first secretary of its Central Committee, emphasized. He said in an interview for MOLDOVA-PRES and TASS correspondents that Saturday's plenum of the MCP restated the firm intention of the republic's Communists to continue following this line in the future too. According to him, the most urgent task now is to declare a moratorium on the proclamation of anti-constitutional formations and to have all deputies representing the Dnestr area and the Gagauz population return to the Moldovan legislature. "It is only in this way, by restoring the republic to the condition it was in prior to the conflict, that we shall be able to resolve all the problems," the interview notes.

Concerning the work of the legislative conciliation commission which he heads, Petr Luchinskiy said: "We are carrying out a great deal of work in Komrat, Tiraspol, Bendery, and other populated localities in Moldova directed at solving the most acute and pressing problems by peaceful means, without the use of force. There are complications, but we are optimists and consider that in a few days' time we shall be able to arrive at mutually acceptable compromises."

Adopt Declaration

LD1011154690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1423 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Text] Kishinev, 10 Nov (TASS)—A plenum of the Moldova Communist Party Central Committee ended here today. As has already been reported, it broke off on 31 October for a meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and a delegation elected by it. The plenum considered the matter "of the sociopolitical situation in the Republic." P.K. Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Moldova Communist Party Central Committee, made a report.

Speakers noted that the situation in Moldova continues to remain complex and explosive. A rigid confrontation between the Moldovan and non-Moldovan part of the population of the Republic is at hand. Only reason and good will by both sides can lead them out of the deadlock.

A declaration adopted by the Moldova Communist Party Central Committee plenum says that under conditions where an intensification of the sociopolitical situation has led to a social explosion and has resulted in human victims, the Moldova Communist Party Central Committee condemns any attempts to resolve interethnic conflicts by force. The document stresses that the attainment of civil peace and national accord is possible only by peaceful means and through joint efforts by all public forces and state structures. There is only one path—dialogue, the search for accord, and a desire to understand each other's interests.

PRAVDA Reports Plenum

PM1311141390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent A. Pasechnik under the "Events in Moldova" rubric: "By Peaceful Means Alone"]

[Text] Kishinev, 10 Nov—A Moldovan Communist Party Central Committee plenum, which discussed the sociopolitical situation in the republic and party organizations' tasks arising from it, has completed its work in Kishinev.

PRAVDA has already reported (2 November this year) that this plenum began 21 October but was interrupted: A delegation of Central Committee members, along with a few public representatives, flew to Moscow to meet the country's president, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. This meeting took place, as reported by the mass media. Today P.G. Luchinskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and first secretary of the Moldovan Communist Party Central Committee, gave Communists a detailed briefing on the ensuing discussion and described the first constructive steps taken by the SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of Moldova Supreme Soviet conciliation committee which he heads.

The plenum adopted a statement after discussing this information, along with recent events in Moldova, when a drastic deterioration in the sociopolitical situation resulted in a social flare-up and casualties. It stresses that the Moldovan Communist Party Central Committee condemns attempts to resolve political and interethnic conflicts by force and believes that civil peace and national accord can only be achieved by peaceful means. The plenum resolutely advocated the observance of the SSR of Moldova's territorial integrity within a renewed union of sovereign states, noting the need to make provision within the new Union treaty for guarantees of such integrity.

Backing the SSR of Moldova Supreme Soviet resolution on urgent steps to stabilize the situation in the republic, the plenum called for a moratorium on the decision to hold elections in the Dnestr region and on the results of similar elections in southern areas. The statement stresses that civil accord and the just resolution of conflicts that arise are only possible with consideration for all national, socioeconomic, and cultural aspects, interests, and rights of the people resident on the territory in question, irrespective of their nationality. That is the main requisite condition for the Moldovan parliament's legislative acts to be effective—both those that have already been adopted and those under elaboration.

In its statement the Moldovan Communist Party Central Committee advocated that proceedings be instituted without fail against all persons involved in the tragic events in Dubossary 2 November this year. Attempts to the republic to kindle anticommunist hysteria and incite people to illegal actions were resolutely condemned.

Participants View Plenum

LD1011200490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1748 GMT 10 Nov 90

[By TASS special correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Kishinev, 10 Nov (TASS)—The absence to date of effective steps to stabilize the situation in Moldova was also evident in the work of the Moldova Communist Party Central Committee plenum, which ended today in the capital of the republic. "Marking time" was how Valentin Krylov, member of the Moldova Communist Party Central Committee, described the plenum in a conversation with the TASS correspondent. In the opinion of Petr Zhuravlev, another participant in the plenum, it had been another attempt to "resolve the issue with the aid of the Communists." In doing so, noted Petr Zhuravlev, it should be remembered that "scarcely anyone in Moldova listens to the opinion of Communists nowadays."

Among the main issues at the plenum was a possible settlement of the interethnic conflict in the republic, where methods of conducting a new nationalities policy have evoked the active hostility of the Russian-speaking residents and Gagauz. In the view of several of those taking part, the plenum demonstrated that the Communist Party of Moldova, a force which until recently was able to exercise a decisive influence on the situation in society, can now effectively do nothing to help.

The epicenter of the conflict has now moved to the east of Moldova where, on the left banks of the Dnestr, in the rayons where the Russian-speaking population predominates, the Dnestr Republic, later declared "unconstitutional" by the Supreme Soviet of Moldova, has been proclaimed. In another, similar republic, the Gagauz Republic, the search for options to escape from the crisis is underway at talks which began recently. The desirability of similar talks with regard to the Dnestr Republic is noted in Kishinev. However, if the republic government is hinting at its readiness for such talks, the leaders of the Dnestr Republic are extremely intransigent in inclination and are demanding the resignation of the entire Council of Ministers and legislature before talks begin.

Nor has the political activity conducted around the situation in Moldova produced any particular results. A sceptical attitude is also evident regarding the activities of the conciliation commission, headed by Petr Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Moldova Communist Party Central Committee, and in connection with the visit to Moldova of a delegation from the Russian legislature.

As for the stance of the USSR Government and Russia, as Tatyana Batushkina, party committee secretary of one of Kishinev's enterprises, told the TASS correspondent, "they have both left us here as hostages." At the same time, she acknowledged that "the situation is so complicated that I don't know how to put it right."

It seems that no one, in or out of Moldova, knows how, and this in part explains the indecision of some, the intransigence of others, and the "non-intervention" of still others. The impression is being created that sooner or later Moldova will have to untangle the mess of contradictions independently, since any ill-thought-through "assistance" could worsen the situation. It is no accident that before leaving Kishinev today, Sergey Kovalev, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputy and a delegation member, who had visited Moldova at the instruction of Boris Yeltsin, told the TASS correspondent: "If a settlement is possible, it will be extremely difficult to arrive at."

TASS Cites Dnestr Calls For Interior Troops

LD0911121990 Moscow TASS in English 1205 GMT 9 Nov 90

[By TASS special correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Dubossary, Moldavia's East, November 9 TASS—The situation that has taken shape in Moldavia's so-called Dnestr Republic is clearly irrational. The confrontation between residents in the Dnestr area and the Kishinev authorities, which erupted into an open clash at the beginning of November and led to loss of life, has entered a cold-war phase.

Although each side realises that methods involving the use of force cannot help solve the problem, matters have not reached the negotiating phase.

The leadership of the Dnestr Republic, which was declared unconstitutional by the Moldavian parliament, puts forward demands which are obviously unacceptable to the Mircha Druk cabinet as conditions for the start of talks with Kishinev.

The demands include the resignation of the cabinet in a body, the resignation of the entire Moldavian parliament and the election of a new but already bicameral one.

Following the tragedy that occurred in Dubossary a week ago, and as a result of which three people died and several people are in hospital with gunshot wounds, the stance of the leaders of the Dnestr left bank has become still more intransigent.

Due the uncertainty of the current situation, the population of the Dnestr area arrived at a conclusion that only the introduction of USSR Interior-Ministry troops to their territory might serve as a way out of the crisis.

"To bring USSR Interior-Ministry troops here is the only way and the only hope," Alexander Porozhan, deputy chairman of the Dubossary City Council of People's Deputies, told TASS. "Only this can calm people down", he added.

Dubossary now resembles a city preparing for a siege. All approaches to it are controlled by teams of cityfolk who keep vigil day and night. Each arriving person is subjected to multiple inspections of identity papers. The local population is electrified, and rumours spread through Dubossary and the entire Dnestr area within minutes.

People in Dubossary have neither strength nor means, weapons including, to repulse a serious onslaught from the right bank, Porozhan admitted.

At the same time he emphasised that actions by the leaders of the Dnestr area are supported by an absolute majority of residents in this region of Moldavia who, he said, are prepared to resist "until the Dnestr area is obliterated".

It is clear that the balancing on the verge on a new clash cannot last indefinitely here and that negotiations are necessary.

Moldovan Minister Views Foreign Policy Positions

LD1211171590 Moscow TASS in English 1658 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By TASS special correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Kishinev November 12 TASS—Moldavian [Moldovan] Foreign Minister Nikolay Tsyu believes the main task of his ministry is to implement Moldavia's sovereign right to its own foreign policy. Lacking sufficient means for independent international relations, the ministry plans to establish contacts first of all with the other Soviet republics and with neighbouring states. Plans are afoot to open missions of Soviet republics in Moldavia.

Some foreign firms have applied for permission to open their offices in Moldavia. Consulates are about to be exchanged with Romania. The proclamation of the republic's sovereignty allowed Moldavia to become more active on the international arena. The Soviet Foreign Ministry has offered it to open Moldavian missions in five Soviet embassies abroad.

Tsyu replied readily to questions about the ministry's work, but tried to avoid the Moldavian-Romanian aspect of the inter-ethnical conflict in the republic. "Don't ask me about this. Don't ask me about the people's front," he said, when asked to clarify the Moldavian Foreign Ministry's attitude to statements issued by leaders of that organisation. One of them calls for "the Moldavian Republic's immediate and unconditional secession from the USSR" and calls on the Romanian Government "to take more vigorous measures to defend Romanians living to the east of the Prut River."

Tsyu stressed that prospects for Moldavian diplomacy would be decided by the new federal treaty. In the meantime, an emergency session of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet has decided not to take part in the elaboration of the treaty until the threat to the republic's territorial integrity was over.

This decision was brought about by the proclamation of the Dnester Republic on Moldavian territory, mostly inhabited by Russian-speaking people, and the Gagauz republic. Both republics resent Kishinev's nationalities policy adopted after the proclamation of Moldavia's sovereignty.

The situation will apparently be clarified by the session of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet that resumed its work here today. But a conflict may be triggered again by the session's boycott by deputies from the Dnester area and Gagauz districts.

Moldovan MVD Minister Urges Political Resolution

PM1211205990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 90 Union Edition p 3

[Report by TASS correspondent V. Demidetskiy: "Moldovan Internal Affairs Minister on Events in Dubossary"]

[Text] Kishinev, 11 Nov—At a news conference in Kishinev today I. Kostash, internal affairs minister of the SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] of Moldova, has expressed dissatisfaction at the fuss created by the central mass media around events in Moldova and, in particular, the deaths in Dubossary. We are unable to call some of them to account because we are extraordinarily busy, but this must be done in the future, he noted.

The minister also criticized the actions of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry [MVD] subunits introduced into southern regions of the republic. In his opinion they are not helping the enforcement of the state of emergency imposed by the republic's legislature there. Major General I. Kostash believes that the introduction of USSR MVD troops into rayons on the left bank, which is what the Dnestr region leaders want, cannot stabilize the situation. This is the aim of those who want to impose a state of emergency throughout Moldova, he stressed.

At the same time the situation in the left bank region remains tense, the general noted. The separatists, who have seized power by force, are blocking the roads and refuse to submit to the legislature and government of Moldova. Their actions, in his opinion, were the main cause of the tragedy in Dubossary. During the operation to clear the blockade of the bridge and the city, which is being carried out on the orders of the Moldova SSR Government, around 1,000 warning shots were fired. Meanwhile the militia were ordered not to use weapons. It has not been ruled out that the deaths resulted from provocation.

Kostash said: "I am deeply convinced that the conflicts which are occurring must be resolved by political methods. First and foremost," in his words, "this should be done by the Moldovan Supreme Soviet."

RSFSR Deputies Visit, Meet Moldova Leader

LD1111140990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1130 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By MOLDOVA-PRESS-TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev, 11 November (TASS)—On Saturday Mircha Snegur, president of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic, received a delegation from the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation headed by Sergey Krasavchenko, chairman of the committee on economic reform and ownership.

In the course of a week, the Russian legislators have met residents of Kishinev, Tiraspol, Bendery, Komrat, and other towns and villages in Moldova. The aim of these meetings was to study the social and political situation in the republic and to uncover the roots of the interethnic conflict which has arisen. The members of the legislative delegation also met leaders of the Moldova National Front.

During their exchange of views, the Russian legislators and the president of Moldova agreed that the existing problems should be solved by legitimate means, excluding the possibility of partitioning the republic. "The Legislator, the government, and the presidential council will do everything possible to preserve the integrity of the republic, for peace and calm to reign in this land and human rights to be observed,." styressed Mirchas Snegur.

In an interview on national television, Sergey Krasavchenko, the leader of the delegation of Russian legislators, noted before their departure from Kishinev that "the possibilities of escaping from the crisis situation without resorting to extreme measures or permitting the laws of the republic and the Union to be violated have not yet been exhausted in Moldova."

"For this to be done," he stressed, "not only must reason and strict observance of legality be shown but also goodwill, patience, and endurance. Both sides must take into account the views, traditions, and customs of their fellow citizens. If all this happens and there is no 'external' influence brought to bear on the citizens of Moldova, the crisis should be overcome in the weeks ahead."

The delegation is to present its conclusions to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

'Thousands' Picket Ukraine Supreme Soviet

LD1211201690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Before the session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet began its work, the square in front of the Supreme Soviet building was picketed by several thousand militia employees this morning. They demanded the adoption of a militia law. The case of the disarmament of a colonel of the criminal investigation department by a crowd, in the presence of several deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet, acted as a spark for this unusual form of behavior on the part of the employees of law enforcement bodies. The procurator's office has commenced a criminal case concerning this incident.

Emotions from the square spread around the hall where the session was taking place. Deputies from various factions blamed each other. An employee of the Kiev criminal investigation department read out a list of demands which the militia put forward to the parliament. They are the most urgent adoption of a militia law, a call for protection of political meetings and processions to be made incumbent upon special formations, and an immediate investigation into the attack on the colonel of the criminal investigation department. Deputies made it incumbent upon the legislative commissions to prepare and submit a draft law on the militia for the Supreme Soviet's examination this week.

Supreme Soviet Considers Demands

LD1211212790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1845 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Stanislav Volnyanskiy]

[Text] Kiev, 12 Nov (UKRINFORM-TASS)—The Ukrainian legislature resumed work today in an atmosphere of inflamed passions. An hour before it began, hundreds of representatives of the public of Odessa, Nikolayev, and Kherson oblasts, as well as employees of Kiev law enforcement bodies and their families, gathered near the Supreme Soviet Soviet building. They came with red and blue banners, placards, and posters carrying the slogans: "We want a sovereign Ukraine", "Our future lies in a union of sovereign republics", "We support socialist choice!", "National rebirth-yes, nationalism-no!", "An unprotected militia will not protect the people", "We demand the adoption of a law on the militia".

Deputies decided to give the floor to representatives of the militia and of the oblasts. Their statement contains demands that the question of adopting a law on the militia should immediately be put on the agenda; that the protection of public order should be laid on special subunits during the implementation of political measures; that a deputies' commission should be set up on checking the law and on decisions on criminal proceedings instituted in cases of unlawful actions during meetings and demonstrations.

The statement by representatives of labor collectives of the three oblasts protests the actions of the opposition minority in parliament, which, in the view of the authors of the statement, are putting a brake on the work of the Supreme Soviet and are distracting it from decisions on urgent social and economic problems. Representatives of more than 100 nations and ethnic groups live on the territory of the Black Sea region. The nationalist tendency of the newly appeared "democrats" is alien to the labor collectives which are international in composition and in essence. The statement stresses that the opposition has assumed the right to speak on behalf of the entire Ukrainian people, although nobody gave it such a right, and it expresses indignation over the provocative and at times hooligan actions of a number of deputies. The document points to the need to actively work out a new union treaty. A weakening of the union will also lead to a weakening of the Ukraine, the statement stresses.

After a stormy discussion, the deputies decided to send the statement by employees of the criminal investigation department to permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet. The statement by the representatives of labor collectives has been handed over to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium.

'Thousands' Attend Rally Over Teacher's Arrest

LD1211165790 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] Thousands attended a meeting today in Ternopol convened by the regional branch of Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka]. The participants demanded immediate release from detention of teacher Yaroslav Davynych from the village of Krasovka. He was charged with taking part in mass riots that broke out on 2 October outside the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet and for hurling offensive remarks at Leonid Kravchuk, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

Upon his arrest on 6 November, Yaroslav Davynych went on a hunger strike, protesting the unlawful—as he says—detention of his person by the investigatory organs.

The meeting in Ternopol ended with the forming of a committee in defense of Yaroslav Davynych, which includes several Ukrainian SSR people's deputies. They intend to make a statement in the republic's legislature tomorrow in connection with the case of Yaroslav Davynych.

Regional Council Discusses Crimean Issues

LD1211201290 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Simferopol November 12 UKRINFORM-TASS—The emergency session of the regional council today discussed the status of the Crimea, a peninsula in the south of the Ukraine, and its attitude to a new union treaty.

This was not the first time deputies had discussed the problem. The instability of the social, political and economic situation in the country and in the republic affected the situation in the peninsula. Withering economic ties, ecological crises and a backward social infrastructure are threatening the Crimea as a health resort. The situation has been aggravated by state red tape in carrying out a programme to return Crimean Tatars to their native land. Crimean Tatars were deported from the peninsula during Stalin's time.

The current status of the region seriously restricts its possibilities in resolving these vital problems. Discussing the idea to restore the Crimean autonomous area abolished in 1945, deputies analysed ways to implement it.

After heated debates, they voted to adopt a declaration on the restoration of the Crimean state and hold a referendum among the population of the peninsula and Crimean Tatars living outside the island, to determine the status of the Crimea. The choice will determine deputies' attitude to a new union treaty.

The session was addressed by president of the Ukrainian parliament Leonid Kravchuk.

Ukrainian Oblast Introduces Coupon System

LD1111151890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] Today a further Ukrainian oblast—Lugansk oblast—introduced a coupon system for selling foodstuffs and industrial goods to the population. This has evoked varying reactions on the part of consumers. The council of the oblast miners' strike committee, for instance, considers that this system will not be able to regulate the consumer market and will lead to further price increases. It demands that the introduction of coupons in the oblast's territory be cancelled. The miners propose that a referendum be held among the oblast's labor collectives and that its results be approved at an extraordinary session of the oblast soviet of people's deputies.

Kiev Taxi Drivers Protest Gasoline Payment System

LD1211144290 Moscow Dometic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Today on Kiev's six main highways, private taxi drivers blocked the movement of municipal transport. In this way the drivers voiced their protest about the recently introduced procedure for paying for gasoline with both cash and vouchers. Moreover, as some private taxi drivers stated, they are left with no vouchers to cover the needs of their own families.

Ukrainian Foreign Ministry Establishes Institute

LD1111204790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 11 November broadcasts a two-minute recorded interview with (Aleksandr Yuryevich Yegorov), first secretary of the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry, by correspondent (Boris Sokolov) on the opening of a consultative institute of international cooperation and research under the Ukrainian Foreign Ministry.

Yegorov says that the demand for professional consultants and experts in foreign affairs is the main reason behind the setting up of the institute. Students will be educated in management, economics, and finance, and following graduation their names will be offered to the United Nations for employment. He says the institute will also participate in the improvement of consular services for Soviet people travelling abroad as well as for foreigners visiting the USSR.

Belorussian Communist Party Officials Meet

LD1211174490 Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian 0515 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] The 21st plenum of the Communist Party [CP] of the Belorussian Central Committee was held yesterday. It was opened by Kamay, second secretary of the Central Committee.

The plenum reviewed the following draft documents of the 31st congress of the CP of Belorussia: the report by the Central Committee to 31st congress, the draft program of the Belorussian CP, the party's position regarding transition to the market system, the party's rules, and others.

Information on the preparations for the congress was delivered by Kamay, second secretary of the CP of Belorussia Central Committee.

Further on Belorussian 7 Nov Statement

LD1111192590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] Today the republican newspapers of Belorussia published a statement by the Belorussian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee Bureau on the events linked to the alternative meetings and demonstrations held on 7 November. It is noted, in particular, that the march and meeting held by the Belorussian People's Front in Minsk were definitely antistate and anticommunist in nature.

Several thousand Minsk inhabitants who gathered in Lenin Square demanded that the BCP and the CPSU immediately be disbanded, their property confiscated, early legislative elections be held, republican sovereignty be established, Soviet Army units be withdrawn from Belorussian territory, and that Belorussian youth be returned to serve in their homeland.

The culmination of the meeting was, undoubtedly, an incident that took place near a monument to Lenin. The leader of the Belorussian People's Front, Zinon Pozdnyak, demanded that a group of 10 people be allowed to approach the pedestal of the monument to lay flowers there, along with items that characterized in his opinion, the content of the country's 73-year history. When this was denied, several thousand people tried to force their way through a militia cordon around the monument. Despite quite tough resistance some of them managed to do so. They placed national flags on the statue of the leader of the revolution and the founder of the state. One of those who managed to break through smashed a bottle of vodka against the pedestal. It is only due to the endurance and good organizational skills of the law enforcement officials that grave consequences were avoided.

The BCP Central Committee Buro considers that the republican government should assess, in principle, thos who allowed the antisoviet action to take place. The statement says that hooligan elements should not be aloowed to get away with violating the law, ignoring decisions by the soviet bodies, and pushing society toward confrontation and opposition.

Caucasus

Georgia Forbids Food Sales Outside Republic

LD1211195890 Moscow TASS in English 1935 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Text] Tbilisi November 12 SAKARTVELO-TASS—Authorities in the Soviet Republic of Georgia have adopted emergency measures to tackle food shortages.

The government has worked out a programme to normalise the situation and provide supplies of goods for the population, ensure rational use of existing resources and bar their export from the republic.

According to the programme, all goods in the retail network will be sold only to residents of Georgia on production of identity cards. Corresponding bodies have been instructed to introduce strict control and take measures to bar the export of consumer goods beyond the republic's borders.

Exports of citric plants and fruit grown this year are strictly limited. Agricultural enterprises have the right to export them only after they fulfil the state order.

The emergency measures envisage also other restrictions, aimed to improve provision of the republic's population with foodstuffs and consumer goods.

Georgians Vote in Runoff Elections 11 Nov

LD1111084890 Moscow TASS in English 0819 GMT 11 Nov 90

[By SAKARTVELO NEWS AGENCY correspondents Eduard Yediberidze and Tengiz Grigalashvili]

[Text] Tbilisi November 11 TASS—Two weeks after parliamentary elections in Georgia, voters in some constituencies went to the polls again today in run-off elections. This year's voting marks the first time since

Soviet power was established that polls on a multi-party basis, using the mixed majority-proportional system, are being held here.

Out of eleven political parties and blocs running in proportional elections, only the "Round Table—Free Georgia" bloc and the Communist Party scored victories, getting 81 and 44 seats respectively.

As for individual candidates, voting was conclusive only in 57 constituencies out of 125. Representatives of the "Round Table" bloc won 33 seats, nearly twice as many as the Communists claimed.

Today's elections were intended to finalise the alignment of forces in Geogia's supreme legislature, which is due to hold the first session on November 14.

Run-off polls are taking place in the 59 constituencies where candidates had not gained more han half of votes.

A second round is being held in seven constitutencies, where voting was inconclusive two week ago. Among the candidates running in these 66 districts, 48 were from the "Round Table" and 34 from the Communist Party.

Included on the ballots were also the names of more than 30 independent candidates, representatives of other parties and blocs who continue to contest seats in the new parliament.

Voters in two more constituencies, where no elections were held on October 28, will go to the polls in two months.

'Round Table' Scores 'Convincing' Win

LD1211205390 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 12 Nov 90

[By unattributed SAKARTVELO-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Tbilisi November 12 TASS—The central election commission summed up tonight the results of last Sunday's run-off elections to the Georgian parliament.

The "Round Table—Free Georgia" scored another convincing victory, winning 41 seats. According to other results from run-off elections in all 59 constituences and the second round of voting in five districts, the Popular Front won 11 Seats, the Communsit Party and the "Democratic Georgia" bloc three each, the All-Georgia Rustaveli Society one and independent candidates five.

Thus, after two rounds of polls, the names of 246 deputies of the new Georgian parliament are known. Of them, 155 represent the "Round Table—Free Georgia" bloc, 64 the Communist Party of Georgia, 12 the Georgian Popular Front, four the "Democratic Georgia" bloc, one the "Liberation and Economic Revival" bloc and the All-Georgia Rustaveli Society. There are also nine independent deputies..

New run-off elections wil be called to elect the remaining four deputies.

The first session of the parliament is to be held on Wednesday.

Georgia Forms Foreign Trade Departments

LD0911114190 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 9 Nov 90

[By TASS special correspondent Igor Gvrtishvili]

[Text] Tbilisi November 9 TASS—The Soviet Transcaucasian Republic of Georgia is reforming its Foreign Ministry to bring it into line with new conditions.

The ministry will now coordinate all foreign policy and foreign economic activity in the republic, help set up joint ventures, find partners and conclude commercial deals.

"Economic decentralisation and the increased sovereignty of the republic have predetermined the innovative nature of the ministry's work, which has no analogues in other Soviet republics. "Georgian Foreign Minister Georgiy Dzhavakhishvili told TASS.

He said traditional forms of the ministry's work have become obsolete in present-day conditions.

"Due to the poor knowledge of the situation on the world market and lack of experience many ministries and departments have established with foreign partners joint ventures that either are unprofitable or, at best, bring small profits."

To improve the situation the Foreign Ministry has set up a number of economic departments headed by experienced economists and experts.

It has also established a concern that includes practically all interested goods-producing ministries and departments and individual enterprises.

The concern's intermediary and consultative efforts have helped Georgian businessmen conclude advantageous deals with partners in Austria, Italy, Yugoslavia and Cyprus. Contacts are also being established with South Korea and Taiwan.

The Foreign Ministry and the concern have also established contacts with the Georgian diaspora in France and set up an association for Georgian-French economic cooperation. Its initial capital is 1.2 billion French francs.

Dzhavakhishvili said that the reform of the Georgian Foreign Ministry is intended to help overcome the economic crisis in the republic and teach people to achieve success in conditions of bitter completition on the international market.

Armenian Commission To Prepare New Constitution

NC1311124590 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 12 Nov 90

[Excerpt] The Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet met on 6 November and went through the entire weekly agenda before the session.

The full session adopted a decision to form a Constitutional Commission under the chairmanship of Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet. The commission will draw up a new Constitution "Basic Law," for the republic in conformity with the declaration "on the independence of Armenia."

Peoples' deputies of the Armenian Republic, scholars, lawyers, and economists are included in the commission. [passage omitted]

Azerbaijan Government Meeting Reported

NC0911102290 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1745 GMT 6 Nov 90

[Text] The regular meeting of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers examined the results of the republic's social and economic development from January to September 1990. Gasan Gasanov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers, chaired the meeting.

It was noted that the results achieved in the republic during the first nine months in 1990 have not created a state of happiness, as has been the case in the rest of the Soviet Union. First of all, the situation has become complex because the republic's organs are gradually losing their current means of managing the economy. The situation is that although the old administrative supervision system has been removed, the new economic methods of the republic's leadership have not been put into effect. Consequently, the work, production, and contract discipline is weakening and the economic relations among the establishments, localities, and regions are disrupted.

Compared with the same period last year, the gross national income from production fell by approximately 900 million rubles, by ll percent, from January to September 1990.

The question of preparations for work in the autumn and winter months in terms of the republic's general economic situation was discussed at the meeting. The meeting's participants believed the discussion of the economic situation in Azerbaijan SSR's Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] was significant. The decision that was adopted to draw up plans for creating special zones in NKAO's rayons in which the Azerbaijani's make up the majority community was approved.

Meanwhile, the meeting examined a number of other matters and adopted relevant decisions.

Central Asia

Kirghizia Appoints New Deputy Premier

LD1011183490 Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGHIZIYA in Russian 1 Nov 90 p 1

[Summary] By decree dated 31 October, Turar Koychuyevich Koychuyev is appointed deputy chairman of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers and chairman of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers' State Commission on Economic Reform.

Weapons Seized at Karaganda Airport

LD1011222390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1740 GMT 10 Nov 90

[Text] Here is another alarming report. A consignment of weapons has been seized at the Tsentralnyy airport of Karaganda. Six pistols made in the FRG and 28 CS-gas cylinders were found in the luggage of a Karaganda citizen who arrived from Lvov. He confessed that he had acquired the gas to sell to certain circles engaged in extortion. According to the KGB directorate for Karaganda Oblast, this consignment of currently popular items leads to a large organization with many branches dealing in the illegal arms trade. Criminal proceedings have been initiated.

Ust-Kamenogorsk Ecological Situation Reviewed

LD1111195690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Report by correspondent A. Laptev in Ust-Kamenogorsk; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The extremely grave ecological situation that has developed in Ust-Kamenogorsk has been exacerbated by a series of faults and accidents which have occurred lately at metallurigical enterprises in direct proximity to residential areas. The official indifference of the Ministry of Metallurgy and Ministry of Atomic Power, impassively surveying all this from their departmental heights, can, on the other hand, quite justifiably be seen as a previously planned push toward a disaster.

[Laptev] A planned disaster. There is no other name for the ecological situation that has developed in the city. Take a look at this mighty palisade of factory chimneys, these toxic plumes of smoke heading straight for kindergartens, schools, and citizens' housing. The railway workers are refusing to service freight from the lead and zinc combine and the (?Rybinskiy) metallurgical works, the city's main polluters. And the recent blast at the Beryllium plant, when a super-toxic metal compound causing irrevocable destructive processes in the human organism, floated over the city, reaching saturation levels in certain areas and over 100 times the maximum acceptable concentration. As the people of Ust-Kamenogorsk dismally predict, it is now the turn of the enriched uranium which is also produced here, within the city limits.

A problem of problems requiring an immediate and effective solution. Nursultan Nazarbayev, the president of the republic, has just been in Ust-Kamenogorsk. His meetings with work collectives, the city's people, the leaders of informal associations, people's deputies, and his acquaintance with the infrastructure of Ust-Kamenogorsk and the daily life of its citizens will, I think, greatly help the president to grasp the essence of the problems here.

Nursultan Abishevich, the demand put forward at the general city meeting, and supported by the body of oblast deputies, on making the oblast an ecological disaster zone, has been rejected by the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh Republic. The situation now is fairly tense, with strike committees being set up.

[Nazarbayev] The people understand things correctly, and I am right behind them over their fears about the existing ecological situation. They are quite rightly raising all these questions. There are no instructions about the Beryllium plant, the seven kilometer zone is not being observed, and so on. Add to these extensive effluents, and the status of an ecological disaster zone has not been defined. What is it? What should follow from this? Does it mean coefficients or some kind of food benefits, or something else? This is being dealt with by the USSR Supreme Soviet, and at our request comrade Salykov, chairman of the Committee for Ecology of the Supreme Soviet, and other specialists came here on a visit. The USSR Supreme Soviet is to examine and establish a status. When this status appears then we will need to have a debate.